

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OwSkXDmV6Io>

[00:00 -> 04:10]

Chairperson:

Participating in today's hearing are Mr. Burchard of Tennessee, Ms. Lunov of Florida, Mr. Getza of Florida, Mr. Burleson of Missouri, Mrs. Ocasio-Cortez of New York, and Mr. Ogles of Tennessee. Without objections, so ordered for today's subcommittee hearing. Both the chair and ranking member will have 10 minutes for opening remarks. We may both be giving some of those minutes to other members of our party.

I'm now going to recognize myself for 10 minutes. I'm actually going to try to get out of here in about four minutes and then we'll give it to some of my friends over here. Good morning and welcome to the most exciting subcommittee in Congress this week, the Subcommittee on National Security of the Board on Foreign Affairs for a discussion of unidentified anomalous phenomena.

I would like to thank the brave military personnel, such as the witnesses on the panel today, for sharing their stories on how they've engaged with UAPs. This has brought attention to this matter. Curiosity and speculation from all walks of life have generated interest in studying what UAPs are and what threats they may pose.

I will say that when I was younger, I read a 1966 book called "Flying Saucers: Serious Business," and for a while, I thought it was the most important issue out there. The lack of transparency regarding UAPs, which was one of the themes of that book, has led to interest in studying what UAPs are and what threats they pose.

The lack of transparency regarding UAPs has fueled wild speculation and debate for decades, eroding public trust in the very institutions that are meant to serve and protect them, as evidenced by the large number of people we have here today. I also want to point out that in 1966, President Gerald Ford claimed to have seen a UFO, and in 1969, Jimmy Carter claimed to have seen a UFO as well.

This has led Congress to establish entities to examine UAPs. The National Defense Authorization Act of 2022 established the All Domain Anomaly Resolution Office (AARO) to conduct or coordinate efforts across the Department of Defense and other federal agencies to detect, identify, and investigate UAPs. However, AARO's budget remains classified, prohibiting meaningful oversight from Congress.

In addition to AARO's efforts, NASA is leading an independent study on UAPs to identify how UAP data gathered from both civilian and government entities can be analyzed to shed light on the topic. However, despite these offices being established, there is a pressing demand for government transparency and accountability that cannot be overlooked, and that has been a problem for 50 years.

The Biden Administration's handling of the Chinese spy balloon that violated U.S. airspace is one example of how the government is not prepared for these situations. The Biden Administration's description

of events has shown that the government continues not to be forthright, particularly regarding the Chinese balloon being shot down and two UAPs subsequently shot down following the event earlier this year. The U.S. government spent one and a half million dollars in taxpayer money on missiles, yet we have seen little clarity from the Biden Administration.

We must demand transparency from the Department of Defense, our intelligence community, and our defense industry regarding UAP work. We are going to ask some questions about that today. Congress recognizes the subject of UAPs as multifaceted and requires a careful, data-driven approach. Today, we will seek clarity from these witnesses' testimonies. I will seek clarity on what can be done to improve reporting for military and civilians and remain committed to objective inquiry. Congress should work to ensure that knowledge is not driven by fear. Today, we are not just debating the existence of UAPs; we are deliberating on the principles that define our Republic.

[04:12 -> 08:06]

Chairman:

I appreciate your commitment to transparency and accountability. I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today about ways we can improve government efficiency and openness when it comes to UAPs. I thank each of you for your presence here today and for your dedication to safeguarding the interests of the American people. I look forward to your testimony, and I'm going to turn it over for two and a half or three minutes to Representative Burchard from Tennessee.

Representative Burchard:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all for being here. I want to thank everybody for making this happen today, and I want to remind everyone that this is a nonpartisan issue. This has nothing to do with party politics. I believe the cover-up goes a lot deeper than that. I also want to thank my colleagues, Representative Anna Paulina Luna, who is sitting beside me here, and Jared Moskowitz. My friend across the aisle has an incredible mind, and I'm anxious to hear his questions. My buddy Eric Burleson is here, and it's not in my notes, but I want to mention Matt Gaetz. If it hadn't been for Matt Gaetz, myself, him, and Luna would still be down at Eglin Air Force Base trying to get some answers. He has an incredible legal mind as well.

I know I saw in the crowd there George Knapp and my buddy Jeremy Corbell. They are not witnesses, but they've provided some statements on this subject. I see unanimous consent to enter those statements into the record, Mr. Chairman, without objection. I would also like to enter into the record a report from the Defense Intelligence Agency titled "Advanced Space Propulsion Based on Vacuum Space-Time Metric Engineering." Some light reading for some of our members, without objection.

You know, Mr. Knapp wrote that since 1969, the position of our military has been that UFOs pose no threat to national security and are not worthy of further study. I would say that's the biggest understatement of the decade. He also discusses the dismissive

attitude that contradicts what was revealed in documents, reports, and internal memos. Mr. Corbell states that the UFO phenomenon is emerging as a major topic of global importance. I can attest to that fact; I met a gentleman who traveled all the way from Denmark to be here for this meeting. This is huge; this is worldwide.

I think we suspect what's going on, but I would also like to thank the members of Congress who have supported our efforts to make this hearing happen. Some have even confided in me that they've had UFO sightings of their own. Those members, of course, wish to remain anonymous, and I will respect that. Finally, I would like to thank these three brave witnesses here. They took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and they are doing it. We owe them our gratitude.

[07:16]

Y'all quit clapping; you're cutting into my time. Just kidding! These folks have nothing to gain from this, and I think you will find that they have endured quite a few slings and arrows. We need to remember them in our prayers and their families. I am thankful for their honest testimonies. They have done interviews and appeared in documentaries like "Accidental Truth" to get their stories out there, and now they are all here to testify under oath for Congress.

It has been so difficult to get here today. In the Baptist Church, we would say that the devil is in our way, and indeed, the devil has been in our way throughout this process. We have run into roadblocks from members of the intelligence community and the Pentagon. I proposed legislation to include in the FAA reauthorization that states if an airline pilot has a sighting, when they make that report to the FAA, it should be...

[08:08 -> 11:32]

Representative:

I was told that the intelligence community did not like that, and the bill and the amendment were not even heard in committee. I think it's time for this country to take back our country. We need to tell the folks at the Pentagon that they work for us; we don't work for them. This is an issue of government transparency. We can't trust a government that does not trust its people. We're not bringing Little Green Men or flying saucers into the hearing sorry to disappoint about half of you. We're just going to get to the facts, uncover the cover-up, and I hope this is just the beginning of many more hearings and more people coming forward about this. I yield back the remainder of my time. Is it to Representative Luna, Mr. Chairman? Yes, we'll call on Ms. Luna for her statement.

The circumstances surrounding UAPs have captivated the attention of the American people for decades, ingrained in the minds of our nation's leaders from Jimmy Carter to Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton to Donald Trump, Marco Rubio, Chuck Schumer, and John Radcliffe, as well as National Security Council officials. Yet, from Roswell, New Mexico, to the coast of Jacksonville, Florida, sightings of UAPs have rarely been explained by those who have firsthand accounts of these

situations. This is largely due to the lack of transparency by our own government and the failure of our elected leaders to make good on their promises to release explanations, footage, and mountains of over-classified documents that continue to be hidden from the American people.

This isn't just how I feel; in fact, the American people largely believe that the government has actively covered up the truth about UAPs. One poll in particular found that 68 percent of Americans believe that the government is hiding information about UAPs and not being honest about what we know about them. From my personal experience, I believe the same thing. Another poll found that nearly half of Americans believe that the federal government is doing a very bad or somewhat bad job of dealing with reports of UFO sightings. As Representative Burchett just referenced regarding the recent bill, you can tell that this is exactly happening, considering the thousands of testimonies and videos taken on people's phones, as well as eyewitness accounts made by credible witnesses such as doctors, pilots, scientists, and active-duty service members. It is unacceptable to continue to gaslight Americans into thinking that this is not happening or that the potential for intelligent life forms exists beyond humans.

Even more alarming is the fact that many of these eyewitnesses are service members who have no assurance that their lives will not be negatively impacted or even harmed by their experiences. As an active-duty service member working on an airfield, I have had conversations with many pilots who were in fear of coming forward due to potential retribution or being taken off flight status. How do we know this? Because the government has said nothing to assure us otherwise. They have also done nothing to calm the concerns of over 20 Americans who have reported seeing UFOs or UAPs. We are simply told not to question the government and that they have it under control.

Today is the first hearing of its kind where we will attempt to get to the bottom of what is actually happening with UAPs. We will hear from people who have had personal sightings rather than Pentagon bureaucrats who have always been sent to stonewall investigations. Just so the press knows and the people know, we were even denied access to a classified briefing in a skiff prior to this hearing due to the amount of hoops we had to jump through to grant temporary clearance to witness those who have knowledge of classified information.

[11:35 -> 15:09]

Chairman:

It is time to have an open-minded discussion on this topic to hear the evidence and understand the magnitude of what this means, not just for our nation but for humanity. Thank you, Chairman. I yield back the rest of my time.

Thank you very much, and I'd like to thank Mr. Burchett for bringing this topic to my attention. Now, we will recognize National Security Subcommittee Ranking Member Garcia for ten minutes.

Garcia:

well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to first thank our witnesses for joining us today. I want to begin by expressing my gratitude for your service to our country and for sharing your voices and courage to be here today. I am particularly grateful to Mr. Graves for spending some time with us to share, with candor, some of your experiences. I appreciate that.

I also want to thank all the members of our subcommittee today, as well as those who are here and have waited on for their incredible interest in this issue. Particularly to Congressman Burchett, I know that your leadership has brought us to this place today, and I want to thank you for that, as well as everyone else who has been engaged in this work.

I also want to thank the oversight staff, who I know have been working very hard to ensure that today's hearing is serious, transparent, and provides appropriate answers, as our oversight body always demands.

Now, it is really important that we are here in a bipartisan way to have this conversation, which, at its heart, is about national security and key to the subcommittee's core purpose. This is the Subcommittee on National Security of the Oversight Committee.

Our witnesses will testify today that UAPs have posed a serious safety threat, and we must understand this more broadly. We are dealing with real questions that get to the heart of our faith in government. Faith in our institutions, as we all know, is at an all-time low. Partisanship and alternative facts make it too easy to doubt narratives or our institutions.

But this hearing will offer the public unique perspectives, building on years of reporting by both federal agencies and the independent media. Some of the earliest reporting on this issue was a groundbreaking 2017 New York Times report, which revealed research on unidentified anomalous phenomena, as many call UFOs, by the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Graves and Commander Fravor's experiences with UAPs have also been documented by the public, not just by the New York Times but by CNN and many other national news outlets. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence has published public reports documenting UAPs, and on June 9, 2022, NASA announced that the agency is commissioning a study to examine unidentified anomalous phenomena.

The sheer number of reports, whistleblowers, and stories of unidentified anomalous phenomena should raise real questions and warrant investigation and oversight, and that is why we are here today. Pilots have reported encounters for years, but because of the stigma around reporting these incidents, we still do not have a complete picture of what is actually going on, particularly as our witnesses will testify on the civilian side. That is a real problem we have today in the country.

It is very important that we show that Democrats and Republicans in Congress can come together in a bipartisan way to cut through misinformation and to look at the facts in a serious and thoughtful manner. If we are to advance oversight and public disclosure, we must also gain the broad support of the public. We will succeed in getting facts out to the public faster if there is broad public support as part of the process.

Now, I fully understand that the Department of Defense is hesitant to share information that could undermine our national security by revealing information on the capabilities of our own aircraft, our sensors, and other sensitive material.

[15:12 -> 18:37]

Chairperson:

At the same time, many people believe that we are withholding information from them, and that is dangerous. I believe in openness and transparency; that is also the role of Congress. I want to trust that the American people will be able to weigh the evidence and make up their own minds.

Now, we have incidents where sensors sometimes even multiple types of sensors detect things that we cannot explain. UAPs, whatever they may be, may pose a serious threat to our military or civilian aircraft, and that must be understood.

My career in training as a long-time educator, teacher, and researcher tells me that we should never rule anything out. We know that our space, of course, is vast and undiscovered. I also want to note that Mr. Sean Kirkpatrick, director of the All Domain Anomaly Resolution Office, the component of the DOD office that investigates UAP data, has testified before the Senate this year that his unit has found no evidence of extraterrestrial life. NASA has also stated they do not have evidence of extraterrestrial life either, and we've heard this, of course, from some of our government agencies.

We should remind viewers and witnesses, which I think is really important, that we also cannot share classified information in public settings. But questions, of course, remain. People want to see data and information for themselves. The enormous interest in the hearing today underscores the importance of a fair and open look at the evidence from witnesses who can share their unique perspectives.

Now, I know I certainly have a lot of questions, and I know that all the members of our committee do as well. We should come to this hearing with an open mind, and we should not let our existing ideas restrict us on either side. I hear over and over from many agencies that a stigma around reporting and investigating UAPs prevents us from getting real answers.

We know that whistleblowers have reported harassment, intimidation, or stigma as well, and this is not acceptable. If people can't report incidents that would have national security or safety implications,

then that also has serious consequences for us. As ranking member of this subcommittee, I know my job would be completely impossible if whistleblowers or others feel intimidated to come before this committee.

We can't be afraid of asking questions, and we can't be afraid of the truth. I'm proud to say that this hearing builds upon bipartisan work by members of the House and Senate dating many years back, which has sought to increase awareness within the Department of Defense and more, and to mandate more from Congress regarding UAPs.

We know the Senate is taking up an amendment to their defense authorization bill, which will create a commission with broad declassification authority, and we can and should all agree that this is an important step. Members of both parties and senior officials in multiple administrations have taken an interest in this issue, and we're proud to carry and build that confidence in the American people.

This hearing will also not be the end of this discussion but a new chapter and the start of years and years of work that many folks, both in the public and within government, have been working on. We should encourage more reporting, not less, on UAPs. The more we understand, the safer we will be.

We look to your testimony from witnesses today, who have a long record of service to the American people and subject matter expertise. Our witnesses have a unique opportunity to share their perspectives, insights, and experiences with the American people, and I encourage all of my colleagues to engage with these difficult questions with an open mind and to follow the facts on behalf of our country.

I also just want to say more broadly that we should look at this hearing and believe that everything is on the table as it relates to UAPs. I think an open mind is absolutely the best approach.

[18:40 -> 22:31]

Representative Moskowitz:

Yielding the remainder of my time to the representative from Florida, Representative Moskowitz, for an opening statement. He has been very much engaged in this issue, and I want to thank him for his leadership. Congressman, thank you, Ranking Member Garcia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank Tim Burchett and Anna Paulina Luna for their leadership in pushing this hearing forward. I also want to thank the committee staff and their staff for working on this on a bipartisan basis because many Americans are deeply interested in this issue, and it shouldn't take the potential of non-human origin to bring us together.

Additionally, I want to thank the witnesses for coming forward to share your perspectives, thoughts, and sightings of UAPs. Unlike other hearings in Congress, you are not here to help a political party; you are here to share information with the American people. This is not something that is just occurring in this Administration; it has

spanned many administrations for decades. Many Americans have been fascinated by mysterious and unexplained objects, and it is long past time that they received some answers.

The American public has a right to learn about technologies of unknown origins, non-human intelligence, and unexplainable phenomena. Those are not the words of a UFO Twitter account; that is a direct quote from Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, stating that the American public has a right to learn about technologies of unknown origins, non-human intelligence, and unexplainable phenomena.

In a recent interview with Fox News, former Director of National Intelligence John Radcliffe confirmed that the U.S. government is aware of many more sightings of UAPs that have not been made public. I quote, "There are a lot more sightings that have not been made public," Radcliffe said to Fox News.

For me, this hearing is about transparency. We unfortunately live in a time when many people distrust the government and our institutions, and the over-classification of information away from the American public or even Congress contributes to today's politics. The American people have legitimate questions: What are UAPs? Why doesn't the media report more on them? Are they foreign adversaries? Are they U.S. technology? Are they something else?

They ask themselves, how come when a Russian jet shoots flares at one of our drones, we have perfect pictures and videos to show the American people and the world, but when it comes to UAPs, we have nothing? Of course, we must always protect our national security to maintain our superiority, like when stealth helicopters were only rumored to exist but were used in the Osama Bin Laden raid in 2011. However, we can't allow that to be used as a shield to keep the American people completely in the dark from basic truths.

The American people deserve to hear more about special access programs. Congress has a right to know if there is any unsanctioned weapons development or satellite imagery that has not been provided to Congress. Congress created the All-domain Resolution Office in the NDAA of 2022. In its initial analysis, there are 171 uncharacterized UAP reports, and these are the words from the report that appear to have demonstrated unusual flight characteristics or performance capabilities.

I believe more information is known about the 171 instances. It is time for Congress to reinsert ourselves. I call on our military leaders and intelligence officials to release more information to the American people about UAPs. To our military leaders, if there is nothing to conceal, let Congress go to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, the Dugway Proving Ground, or even Groom Lake in Nevada. We should have disclosure today; we should have disclosure tomorrow. The time has come. Thank you, Ranking Member.

[22:34 -> 26:17]
Chairman:

Thank you, Mr. Moskowitz. I would yield back now to our chairman.
Thank you.

Right now, I'd like to introduce our witnesses. Our first witness is Lieutenant Ryan Graves, the executive director of Americans for Safe Aerospace. Lieutenant Graves is also a former U.S. Navy F-18 pilot with his own UAP experience. The next witness, David Grusch, is a former senior intelligence officer with the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency and was a senior technical advisor for UAP issues. Finally, we have retired Navy Commander David Fravor, a squadron leader who worked as a Naval aviator for 18 years. Mr. Fravor has his own UAP experience known as the "Tick Tock" event. I look forward to hearing from all three of you today.

Pursuant to committee rule 9(g), the witnesses will please stand and raise their right hands.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Let the record show that all the witnesses answered in the affirmative. You may be seated.

We appreciate you all being here today and look forward to your testimony. I'll remind the witnesses that we have read your written statements, and they will appear in full in the hearing record. Please try to limit your oral statements to five minutes. As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you so that it's on, and the members can hear you when you begin to speak. The light in front of you will turn green; after four minutes, it will turn yellow, and the red light, when that comes on, indicates that your five minutes have expired.

I'll now recognize Mr. Graves for five minutes for your opening statement.

Ryan Graves:

Thank you, Chairman Rothman, Ranking Member Garcia, and distinguished members of the House Oversight Subcommittee on National Security, Representative Burchett and Luna.

My name is Ryan Fobs Graves, and I'm a former F-18 pilot with a decade of service in the U.S. Navy, including two deployments in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Inherent Resolve. I have experienced advanced UAP firsthand, and I'm here to voice the concerns of more than 30 commercial aircrew and military veterans who have confided their similar encounters with me.

Today, I would like to highlight three critical issues that demand our action. First, UAP are in our airspace, but they are grossly underreported. These sightings are not rare or isolated; they are routine. Military aircrew and commercial pilots, trained observers whose lives depend on accurate identification, are frequently witnessing these phenomena.

Second, the stigma attached to UAP is real and powerful, and it challenges national security. It silences commercial pilots who fear

professional repercussions and discourages witnesses. This issue is only compounded by recent government claims questioning the credibility of eyewitness testimony.

Lastly, parts of our government are aware of more about UAP than they let on. The excessive classification practices keep crucial information hidden. Since 2021, all UAP videos are classified as secret or above. This level of secrecy not only impedes our understanding but fuels speculation and mistrust.

In 2014, I was an F-18 Foxtrot pilot in the Navy Fighter Attack Squadron 11, the Red Rippers, stationed at NAS Oceana in Virginia Beach. After upgrades were made to our jets' radar systems, we began detecting unknown objects operating in our airspace. At first, we assumed there were radar errors, but soon we began to correlate the radar track with multiple onboard sensors, including infrared systems. Eventually, through visual identification during a training mission in Warning Area Whiskey 72, 10 miles off the coast of Virginia Beach, two F-18 Super Hornets were split by UAP. The object was described as a dark gray or black cube inside of a clear sphere.

[26:19 -> 29:58]

Speaker:

During a recent encounter, we were within 50 feet of the lead aircraft, which was estimated to be 5 to 15 feet in diameter. The mission commander terminated the flight immediately and returned to base. Our squadron submitted a safety report, but there was no official acknowledgment of the incident and no further mechanism to report the sightings. Soon, these encounters became so frequent that aircrew began discussing the risks of Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP) as part of their regular pre-flight briefs.

Recognizing the need for action and answers, I founded Americans for Safe Aerospace. The organization has since become a haven for UAP witnesses who were previously silent due to the absence of a safe intake process. More than 30 witnesses have come forward, and almost 5,000 Americans have joined us in the fight for transparency at safeaerospace.org. The majority of witnesses are commercial pilots from major airlines, many of whom are veterans with decades of flying experience.

Pilots are reporting UAP at altitudes that appear above them, at around 40,000 feet, potentially in low Earth orbit or in the gray zone below the Kármán line, making inexplicable maneuvers such as right-hand turns and retrograde orbits, or j-hooks. Sometimes these reports are recurring, with numerous recent sightings north of Y and in the North Atlantic. Other veterans are also coming forward regarding UAP encounters in our airspace and oceans. The most compelling cases involve observations of UAP by multiple witnesses and sensor systems. I believe these accounts are only scratching the surface, and more will share their experiences once it is safe to do so.

In closing, I recognize the skepticism surrounding this topic. If

everyone could see the sensor and video data I witnessed, our national conversation would change. I urge us to put aside stigma and address the security and safety issues this topic represents. If these are foreign drones, it is an urgent national security problem; if it is something else, it is an issue for science. In either case, unidentified objects are a concern for flight safety. The American people deserve to know what is happening in our skies; it is long overdue. Thank you.

[28:20 -> 29:58]

David Charles Grusch:

Mr. Chairman, ranking members, and congressmen, thank you. I'm happy to be here. This is an important issue, and I'm grateful for your time. My name is David Charles Grusch. I was an intelligence officer for 14 years in the U.S. Air Force, both on active duty and in the Air National Guard and Reserve, at the rank of Major. Most recently, from 2021 to 2023, I served at the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA) at the GS-15 civilian level, which is the military equivalent of a full bird colonel.

I was my agency's co-lead on unidentified anomalous phenomena and transmedium object analysis, as well as reporting to the UAP Task Force (UAPTF) and eventually, once it was established, the All Domain Anomaly Resolution Office (Arrow). I became a whistleblower through a PPD-19 urgent concern filing in May 2022 with the Intelligence Community Inspector General, following concerning reports from multiple esteemed and credentialed current and former military and intelligence community individuals that the U.S. government is operating with secrecy above Congressional oversight regarding UAPs.

My testimony is based on information I have received from individuals with a long-standing track record of legitimacy and service to this country, many of whom have also shared compelling evidence in the form of photography, official documentation, and classified materials.

[30:01 -> 30:26]

Speaker:

I provided oral testimony to myself and many of my various colleagues. I have taken every step I can to corroborate this evidence over a period of four years while I was with the UAP task force, and I have done my due diligence on the individuals sharing it. Because of these steps, I believe strongly in the importance of bringing this information before you. I am driven by a commitment to both truth and transparency, rooted in our inherent duty to uphold the United States Constitution and protect the American people. I am asking Congress to hold our government to this standard and thoroughly investigate these claims. As I stand here under oath now, I am speaking to the facts as I have been told them. In the U.S. Air Force, in my National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) reserves capacity, I was a member of the UAP task force from 2019 to 2021. I served at the Narrow Operations Center on the Director's Briefing Staff, which included the coordination of the Presidential Daily Brief and supporting a variety of contingency operations. I was the Reserve Intelligence Division Chief. Back in 2019, the UAP task force director asked me to identify

all special access programs and controlled access programs, also known as SAPs and CAPs. We needed to satisfy our congressionally mandated mission, and we were a direct report at the time to the Deputy Secretary. Due to my extensive executive-level intelligence support duties, I was cleared to all relevant compartments and was in a position of extreme trust, both in my military and civilian capacities. I was informed, in the course of my official duties, of a multi-decade UAP crash retrieval and reverse engineering program, to which I was denied access to those additional read-ons when I requested it. I made the decision, based on the data I collected, to report this information to my superiors and multiple Inspectors General, effectively becoming a whistleblower. As you know, I have suffered retaliation for my decision, but I am hopeful that my actions will ultimately lead to a positive outcome of increased transparency. Thank you, and I am happy to answer your questions.

[30:28 -> 33:00]

David Fravor:

Thank you, Commander. Mr. Chairman, Congressmen, Congresswomen, I want to first thank you for the invitation to speak to the committee on the UAP topic. This has been in the news for the past six years and seems to be continuing to gain momentum. As you know, my name is David Fravor. I am a retired Commander in the United States Navy. In 2004, I was the commanding officer of Strike Fighter Squadron 41, the world-famous Black Aces, which was attached to Carrier Air Wing 11 stationed on board the USS Nimitz. We began a two-month workup cycle off the coast of California. On this day, we were scheduled for a 2v2 area training with the USS Princeton as our control. When we launched off the Nimitz, my wingman was joining up when we were told that the training was going to be suspended and that we were going to proceed with real-world tasking. As we proceeded to the west, the air controller was counting down the range to an object that we were going to, and we were unaware of what we were going to see when we arrived. The controller informed us that these objects had been observed for over two weeks, coming down from over 80,000 feet, rapidly descending to 20,000 feet, hanging out for hours, and then going straight back up. For those who don't realize, above 80,000 feet is space. We arrived at the location at approximately 20,000 feet, and the controller called "merge plot," which means that our radar was now in the same resolution cell as the contact. As we looked around, we noticed that we saw some white water off our right side. It's important to note that the weather on this day was as close to perfect as you could ask for off the coast of San Diego.

[33:59 -> 37:24]

Former Military Personnel:

The skies were clear, with light winds and calm seas, and there were no whitecaps from the waves, so the white water stood out in the large blue ocean. All four of us were in F-18Fs, with pilots in the front and a WISO in the back seat. We looked down and saw a small white Tic Tac object with a longitudinal axis pointing north-south, moving very abruptly over the water like a ping pong ball. There were no rotors, no rotor wash, or any visible control surfaces like wings.

As we started to circle clockwise towards the object, my WISO and I decided to go down and take a closer look, while the other aircraft stayed in high cover to observe both us and the Tic Tac. We proceeded around the circle about 90 degrees from the start of our descent, and the object suddenly shifted its longitudinal axis, aligned itself with my aircraft, and began to climb.

We continued down another 270 degrees, nose low, where the Tic Tac would have been. Our altitude at this point was about 15,000 feet, while the Tic Tac was about 12,000 feet. As we pulled nose onto the object, within about half a mile of it, it rapidly accelerated in front of us and disappeared. Our wingman, roughly 8,000 feet above us, also lost contact. We immediately turned back to see where the white water was, and it was gone as well.

As we started to turn back towards the east, the controller came up and said, "Sir, you're not going to believe this, but that thing is at your cat point, roughly 60 miles away, in less than a minute." You can calculate the speed. We returned to the Nimitz, took off our gear, and talked to one of my cruisers who was getting ready to launch. We mentioned it to him, and they went out and luckily got the video that you see the 90-second video.

What you don't see is the radar tape that was never released, and we don't know where it's at, of the act of jamming that the object put on an APG-73 radar. I can get into modes later if you're interested. What is shocking to us is that the incident was never investigated. None of my crew were ever questioned, tapes were never taken, and after a couple of days, it turned into a great story with friends.

It wasn't until 2009 that Jay Stratton contacted me to investigate. Unbeknownst to me, he was part of the ATIP program and the Pentagon, led by Lou Elizondo. There was an official report that came out, which is now on the internet. Years later, I was contacted by the other pilot, Alex Dietrich, who asked if I had been contacted, and I said no, but I was willing to talk.

I was contacted by Mr. Elizondo, and we talked for a short period of time. He said we would be in contact a few weeks later. After that, I learned that Lou had left the Pentagon in protest and joined forces with Tom DeLonge, Chris Mellon, Steve Justice, and others to form To The Stars Academy, an organization that pressed the issue with leading industry experts and U.S. government officials.

They worked with Leslie Kean, who was present today, Rob Blumenthal, and Helene Cooper to publish articles in the New York Times in 2017, which removed the stigma on the topic of UFOs. This is why we're here today. Those articles opened the door for the government and the public that cannot be closed. It has led to an interest from our elected officials who are not focused on little green men but on figuring out where these crafts are, where they are from, the technology they possess, and how they operate.

It also led to the Whistleblower Protection Act in the NDAA. There are

multiple witnesses coming forward to say they have first-hand knowledge, and Mr. Grusch just covered that. What concerns me is that there's no oversight from our elected officials on anything associated with our government processing or working on craft I believe are not from this world. This issue is not about full public disclosure that could undermine national security, but it is about ensuring that our system of checks and balances works across all work done in the government using taxpayer funds, relative to government programs, even unacknowledged programs, which should have some level of oversight by the appropriate committee members.

[37:25 -> 41:15]

House Representative:

The work being conducted based on whistleblower testimonies should not be exempt. In closing, I would like to say that the Tic Tac object we engaged with in 2004 was far superior to anything we have today or are looking to develop in the next ten years. If we indeed have programs that possess this technology, they need oversight from those whom the citizens of this great country elected to represent what is best for the United States and its citizens. I thank you for your time. Thank you very much. It has been very difficult for all of you to illuminate this issue.

I will now call on Mr. Graves for some questions. I'm going to start with you, Mr. Graves. Are the pilots you interact with as part of your organization adequately trained and briefed on how to handle encounters with UAPs?

Mr. Graves:

No, right now military witnesses to UAPs have limited options for reporting. More concerning is that the commercial aviation sector has not adapted to the lessons that the military has implemented. The military and the Department of Defense have stated that UAPs represent a critical aviation safety risk, but we have not seen that same language being used in the commercial markets. They are not acknowledging this risk.

House Representative:

What steps do you think need to be taken to improve pilot reporting, whether military or commercial?

Mr. Graves:

Right now, we need a system where pilots can report without fear of losing their jobs. There is a fear that the stigma associated with this topic will lead to professional repercussions, either through management or perhaps during their yearly physical check. Having a secure system, reducing the stigma, and making this information available to the public will help alleviate the concerns that aircrew have.

House Representative:

Could you give me an idea of the degree to which reports in the past have not been made public?

Mr. Graves:

I don't think there has been a proper reporting system to gather those reports, and thus they have not been reported. To answer your question, I believe there is a dearth of data due to the limited reporting up to this time.

House Representative:

Can you tell me why you believe there are reasons why some of this information should not be available to the public?

Mr. Graves:

There are certainly some national security concerns when we use our advanced sensors and tactical jets to identify these objects. However, there is no reason that the objects themselves should be classified. I would be curious to see how the security classification guidelines actually spell out the different nuances of how this topic is classified from the perspective of UAPs, not national security.

House Representative:

I'll give you a follow-up on that. Assuming there are reasons why not all of this should be made public, this has been around for a long time. Can any of the three of you think of any reason why anything related to UAPs from 15 years ago and earlier should not be immediately made public?

Mr. Graves:

I think one reason is acknowledging a vulnerability from both a collection and countermeasure perspective. We haven't cracked many of these cases for years, even going back 20 years. Is there any reason why things from that far back shouldn't be made public unless they show a specific national security vulnerability related to a weakness in particular defenses?

House Representative:

Mr. Fravor, the Tic Tac incident you were engaged in occurred in 2004. What kind of reporting took place after that incident?

Mr. Fravor:

We had a standard debrief where the backseaters went down to our carrier Intel Center and briefed what had happened, and that was it. No one else talked to us. I was in the top 20 in the battle group, and no one came. The captain was aware, the admiral was aware, but nothing was done.

House Representative:

Did your commanding officers provide any sort of justification?

Mr. Fravor:

No, because I was the commanding officer of...

[41:18 -> 45:01]

Speaker 1:

was this incident the only UAP event that you encountered while you were a pilot?

Speaker 2:
Yes, it was.

Speaker 1:
This question is for any one of you. Based on your experiences and observations, do you believe UAPs pose a potential threat to our national security?

Speaker 2:
Yes, and here's why: the technology that we faced was far superior to anything we had. If you captured one and reverse-engineered it, you would have something that could go into space, drop down in a matter of seconds, do whatever it wants, and leave. There's nothing we can do about it nothing.

Speaker 3:
From both commercial and military aviation perspectives, we deal with uncertainty in our operating space as a matter of professional protection. Identifying friend from foe is very important to us. When we have unidentified targets and continue to ignore them due to stigma or fear of what they could be, that creates an opening that our adversaries can exploit.

Speaker 1:
What steps should we take to better understand and respond to UAP encounters in the interest of national security?

Speaker 3:
There needs to be a centralized location for processing this information, along with a two-way communication loop. The operators on the front end should receive feedback and best practices on how to process information and what actions to take, ensuring that their reporting is being listened to. Right now, there isn't much back and forth.

Speaker 1:
Mr. Gresh, in your complaint to the Intelligence Community Inspector General, you claim that you believe information is being hidden. What kind of information do you think is being concealed, and do you believe it should remain hidden?

Speaker 4:
Yes, I can speak to that briefly in an unclassified manner. The preponderance of my complaint was classified to the intelligence communities, including material acquisition and exploitation activity, as well as baselining the UAPs without sharing that information with intelligence professionals who are conducting briefings for pilots.

Speaker 1:
Thank you very much. Now we'll go to Mr. Garcia.

Mr. Garcia:
Thank you. Again, thank you all for your service and for testifying

today. I want to discuss UAPs in relation to pilots' interactions with them. Particularly, Mr. Graves, one of the concerns for members of this committee is the lack of a system for pilots to report UAPs and the stigma surrounding these reports. Can you briefly elaborate on this?

Mr. Graves:

Certainly. I'm currently working with 30 pilots who have had encounters with UAPs, but I know of many more who have had similar experiences. This is just the group I'm currently engaged with.

Mr. Graves:

When we first experienced these objects off the Eastern Seaboard from 2014 to 2015, anyone who had upgraded their radar systems was detecting these objects. A large number of my colleagues were seeing them and correlating that information with other onboard systems. Many of them also had their own sightings of these objects.

Mr. Graves:

That was our firsthand experience at the time. Since then, as I've engaged with this topic, others have reached out to share their experiences, both from the military and commercial aviation sides. Veterans who have recently left the military have shared their stories, expressing that the objects we observed in 2014 and 2015 continued to appear all the way to 2019, 2020, and beyond. It has become a generational issue for Naval aviators on the Eastern Seaboard.

[45:03 -> 48:27]

Speaker 1:

Briefing to new students, this is something that was included in the notice to Airmen to ensure that there were no accidents. Now, with commercial aviators, they are reaching out because they're having somewhat similar experiences as our military brothers and sisters, but they do not have any reporting system to send this information to. Let me just add, both to Mr. Fravor and Mr. Graves, that not having this system for reporting is harmful not just to our national security interests but also to our understanding of this phenomenon regarding UAPs.

I think it's a travesty that we don't have a system to correlate this and actually investigate. If you take the East Coast, there are Coastal Radars that monitor our air defense identification zone, extending out to 200 miles. They can track these objects, so when you see them, they could actually pull that data and analyze their maneuvers. Instead of just relying on the airplanes, there are other data sources available. I've talked to other government officials about this. We need a centrally located repository for these reports. If you just stuck it in the Department of Defense, you wouldn't get anything out of the intelligence community because they tend not to communicate. However, if you had a central location where these reports could come in not just from the military but also from commercial aviation there's a lot going on, especially if you talk to anyone who flies from here to Hawaii over the Pacific; they see odd

lights. Therefore, I think we need to develop something that allows for a central point to collect the data in order to investigate.

Mr. Graves:

I would concur with everything Mr. Fravor said. I will continue to say that the commercial pilots who have reached out to me through Americans for Safe Aerospace are doing so because they don't feel there is another way for them to report their safety issues. One of the clear outcomes of this hearing is that there has to be a safe and transparent reporting process for pilots, both on the commercial side and the military side, to report UAPs in a way that is transparent and also considers the scope of our national security interests, including what may be classified or not. I believe there has to be some sort of system, and I hope that this committee can work on that.

Is there anything else, just for the two of you, beyond this reporting system that you think we can do as a government to encourage and facilitate more civilian reporting?

Speaker 1:

I'm just doing it right now. Okay, great. I think this hearing is going to show the American people that their government takes this topic seriously. How can civilians who may not be pilots report their UAP encounters? Do either of you have suggestions that could facilitate that?

Mr. Graves:

My recommendation would be to make this a sensor-centric operation to ensure it is as objective as possible.

Speaker 1:

Mr. Fravor?

Mr. Fravor:

No, I agree with Mr. Graves on that.

Speaker 1:

Just briefly, I also want to note, particularly for the two pilots, that I have a question for Mr. Grush. One of the things I found fascinating in our discussion last night, Mr. Graves, is that you've both described UAPs in formations and the way they are observed in our airspace, as well as how they move. Essentially, they operate in ways that current technology or aircraft cannot. For the public record, could you briefly describe or note that the aircraft being witnessed, particularly by the thirty individuals you are working with, are essentially outside the scope of anything that we know?

[48:29 -> 52:06]

Mr. Graves:

The objects that are being seen by commercial pilots are performing maneuvers that are unexplainable due to our current understanding of technology and our capabilities as a country. This applies to the military as well.

Mr. Favor:

I concur with that. We have nothing that can stop in midair and go in the other direction, nor do we have anything that can, in our situation, come down from space, hang out for three hours, and then go back up.

Mr. Graves:

Thank you. My last question is, I know that some of you have also provided answers in the past. We're trying to get them on the public record as well, which is really important. Mr. Grush, do you believe that our government is in possession of UAPs?

Mr. Grush:

Absolutely. Based on interviewing over 40 witnesses over four years, I know the exact locations, and those locations were provided to the Inspector General and some of which to the intelligence committees. I actually had the people with first-hand knowledge provide a protective disclosure to the Inspector General. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that I think these questions are important, and I look forward to being involved in the process to get those answered. I know there will be a lot of questions from the committee members, so I yield back.

Mr. Merchant:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Garcia. I would like to have you on my legislation to do just that regarding the reporting. We'll get together on that; maybe you could be my co-sponsor on that. That would be really cool. Thank you for those great questions.

Mr. Graves:

Again, I'd like to know how you know that these were not our aircraft.

Mr. Favor:

Some of the behaviors that we saw in a working area included these objects being at 0.0 Mach, which is zero airspeed, over certain pieces of the ground. What that means is, just like a river, if you throw a bobber in, it's going to float downstream. These objects were staying completely stationary in category four hurricane winds. These same objects would then accelerate to supersonic speeds, 1.1 to 1.2 Mach, and they would do so in very erratic and quick behaviors that I don't have an explanation for.

Mr. Graves:

Have you spoken to commercial military pilots that have seen these off our East Coast?

Mr. Favor:

I have.

Mr. Merchant:

I noticed that in the Tic Tac video, it's Tic Tac like the candy, not TikTok like the Chinese Communist app.

Mr. Favor:

That's correct, yes sir. I just want to clarify that because my daughter corrected me on that and called me a boomer. I said, "No, baby, it's Tic Tac like the candy. You're going to have to just look it up." But now, I would like to say today is a day of many firsts. It's a miracle that we're having this meeting, and it's also a miracle that my wife has put up with me for nine years today. Today is my anniversary, so I want to tell my wife happy anniversary and that I love her very much.

Mr. Favor:

As she likes to say, these nine years have been the best two years of her life. Thank you.

Mr. Merchant:

Mr. Favor, what astonished you the most about the flight capabilities of these Tic Tacs? Very briefly.

Mr. Favor:

The performance absolute performance. You're not aware of any other objects that anyone in the world has that possess those capabilities?

Mr. Favor:

No, I think it's far beyond our material science that we currently possess. Are you aware of any other reconnaissance platforms that tracked or recorded the Tic Tacs' maneuvers, maybe the NORAD system or any of the others?

[52:08 -> 56:13]

Mr. Grosh:

I am not okay. Thank you for being here, brother. Thank you all very much. Have you faced any retaliation or reprisals for any of your testimony or anything along these lines?

Witness:

Yes, I have to be careful about what I say in detail because there is an open whistleblower reprisal investigation on my behalf, and I don't want to compromise that investigation by providing any information that may help someone. It was very brutal and unfortunate; some of the tactics they used to hurt me, both professionally and personally, were quite frank. It's very unfortunate, as they say, when you're the target, that's when they do the most firing at you.

Mr. Grosh:

Do you have any personal knowledge of people who have been harmed or injured in efforts to cover up or conceal this extraterrestrial technology?

Witness:

Yes.

Mr. Grosh:

Personally, have you heard of anyone being murdered that you would

think you know of or have heard of?

Witness:

I guess I have to be careful asking that question. I directed people with that knowledge to the appropriate authorities. Maybe if we could get into a confidential area, a skiff, we could talk about that. Unfortunately, we were denied access to the skiff, and that's very unfortunate in this scenario.

Mr. Favor:

Do you believe that you witnessed an additional object under the water in relation to your encounter?

Witness:

I will say we did not see an object. There was something there to cause the white water, and when we turned around, it was gone. So there was something there that obviously moved.

Mr. Favor:

Okay, it was not the same object that you were looking at, correct?

Witness:

No, we actually joked that the Tic Tac was communicating with something when we came back because the white water disappeared. In another instance, we were told about the capabilities of jamming during the viewing of some of these objects. Did you experience any of that jamming or interruption of your radar or weapon system?

Witness:

My crew that launched after we landed experienced significant jamming of the APG-73 radar, which was what we had on board. It is a mechanically scanned, very high-end system prior to the APG-79. Yes, it did pretty much everything you could do range, velocity, aspect and then it hit the lock, and the targeting pod is passive. That's how we were able to get the video.

Mr. Grosh:

I'm about to run out of time, but are you aware of any of our enemies that have that capability?

Witness:

No.

Mr. Grosh:

I would also like to know for the record that George Knapp, breaking Area 51, is the reason I knew about that, and the reason I know about the Tic Tacs is Leslie Kane from the New York Times article. I would encourage everybody to read that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back to you for no time.

Mr. Askin:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Graves, you reported UAP encounters during training flights, I think, and have since come forward to warn the Pentagon that these encounters may be putting pilots at risk.

My first question is, you've identified these as taking place on the East Coast. Is it just on the East Coast where these encounters have been reported?

Witness:

No, since the events initially occurred, I've learned that the objects have been detected essentially wherever Navy operations are being conducted across the world, and that's from the All Domain Anomaly Resolution Office reporting.

Mr. Askin:

Can you describe your experience after you decided to come forward and go public with your experience?

Witness:

Certainly. Like many others, in 2017, I saw the New York Times article come out as well, and for me, it was special because I recognized the voices on the video. I recognized the video itself; I had seen it when it was taken, and I had seen it when it was debriefed.

[56:16 -> 59:56]

Speaker 1:

It kind of shook me because I realized that this problem was still ongoing. I reached out to colleagues back on the East Coast and realized that this was still a safety risk they were dealing with. They had essentially hit a wall with how they could move forward on this conversation. It was at that point when I decided to try to move the conversation forward myself.

Are there common characteristics to the UAPs that have been cited by different pilots? Can you describe what the convergence of descriptions is?

Certainly, we were primarily seeing dark gray or black cubes inside of a clear sphere. I'm sorry, dark gray or black cubes inside of a clear sphere where the apex or tips of the cube were touching the inside of that sphere. That was primarily what was being reported when we were able to gain a visual tally of these objects, and that occurred over almost eight years. As far as I know, it's still occurring.

[Music]

So, I take it that you're arguing we need real transparency in a reporting system so we can get some clarity on what's going on out there because there are many pilots in your situation. We should have a way of developing a systematic inventory of all such encounters, is that right?

Yes, and I think we need both transparency and reporting. We have the reporting, but we need to make sure that information can be promulgated to commercial aviation as well as the rest of the populace.

Mr. Crush, what about you? What was your experience after you came forward?

well, it's only been about two months or so, so I guess my experience has been overwhelming support from former colleagues of mine who have privately messaged me, and I do appreciate that. However, I do have knowledge of active planned reprisal activity against myself and other colleagues, and it's very upsetting to me coming from certain senior leadership at previous agencies I was associated with. That's all I'll say publicly, but I can provide more details in a closed environment.

Okay, well, I hope you understand that there would be bipartisan rejection of any attempt to vilify, demonize, or engage in other reprisals against our witnesses and people who are telling the truth from their perspective.

Yes, there were certain colleagues of mine who were brutally administratively attacked, and it actually makes me very upset as a leader to see that happen to other co-workers and even superiors of mine over the last three years. How do you account for that response? That seems like a bizarre response.

I call it administrative terrorism. That's their quiver, their tool in the toolbox to silence people, especially those in career government service who care about their clearance and reputation to climb the ladder. When you threaten that career path, a lot of people back off. But I'm here to represent those people.

Mr. Fravor, what about you? What has your experience been since you've come forward with your perspective on this?

Actually, I've been treated very well. The six people involved, myself included, all of them have or will be retiring from the military as O-5s and O-6s. All my friends who are very senior, three and four stars, I've talked to them. They believe they understand there's a problem, but no, I was actually treated really well.

And what is your general interpretation of these phenomena? What is your current thinking of trying to make sense of them?

well, I'll say, you know, I'm not like a UFO fanatic; that's not me. But I will tell you that what we saw...

[1:00:00 -> 1:03:45]

Chairman:

with four sets of eyes over a five-minute period, still there's nothing. We have nothing close to it. It was amazing to see. I told my buddy I wanted to fly it, but yeah, it's just incredible technology. All right, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I'll yield back to you.

[1:00:17 -> 1:00:21]

Ms. Luna:

Mr. Grush, in speaking to you yesterday, I just wanted to follow up on Representative Raskin's questions.

[1:00:25 -> 1:00:39]

Ms. Luna:

In the last couple of years, have you had incidents that have caused you to fear for your life for addressing these issues?

[1:00:39 -> 1:00:42]

Mr. Grush:

Yes, personally.

[1:00:42 -> 1:00:52]

Ms. Luna:

I just want everyone to note that he's coming forward in fear for his life. To put it in perspective, if they were really not scared about this information coming out, why would someone be intimidated like that?

[1:00:52 -> 1:01:01]

Ms. Luna:

To your knowledge, are non-human entities working with adversarial foreign governments in either technology exchange programs or back-engineering programs?

[1:01:01 -> 1:01:03]

Mr. Grush:

I don't have data on that. I'm not sure.

[1:01:03 -> 1:01:10]

Ms. Luna:

Have you heard or had people come forward to present that evidence?

[1:01:10 -> 1:01:12]

Mr. Grush:

Not that particular evidence that you just exposed.

[1:01:12 -> 1:01:30]

Ms. Luna:

On the 19th of April, Dr. Kirkpatrick, head of Arrow, stated that he did not find any evidence of UAPs. You also mentioned in your interview that you briefed him on information you were uncovering, but he did not follow up with you. Were the items that you divulged to him put into National Security?

[1:01:30 -> 1:01:39]

Mr. Grush:

Yes, he and I had a classified conversation in April 2022 before he took over Arrow in July 2022, and I provided him some concerns I had.

[1:01:39 -> 1:01:45]

Ms. Luna:

Do you know why he might not have followed up with you?

[1:01:45 -> 1:01:50]

Mr. Grush:

Unfortunately, I cannot read his mind. I wish he did. I was happy to give sage counsel to him on where to look when he took the helm of Arrow.

[1:01:50 -> 1:02:04]

Ms. Luna:

Okay, and then my last question for you before I move to Mr. Graves is, you received prior approval from the Defense Department to speak on certain issues, correct?

[1:02:04 -> 1:02:06]

Mr. Grush:

Correct, through DOD pre-publication and security review.

[1:02:06 -> 1:02:16]

Mr. Grush:

I just want to remind the public that these are my own personal views and opinions, not the Department's.

[1:02:16 -> 1:02:27]

Ms. Luna:

I asked to credit you, so it does bring a certain amount of credibility to your testimony.

[1:02:27 -> 1:02:30]

Mr. Grush:

I'm required by law to do that as a former intelligence officer, or I could go to jail for revealing classified information.

[1:02:30 -> 1:02:32]

Ms. Luna:

Yeah, we don't want you to go to jail.

[1:02:32 -> 1:02:35]

Ms. Luna:

My next question would actually be for Mr. Graves. Can you please explain to me in detail the event that occurred at Vandenberg Air Force Base?

[1:02:39 -> 1:02:45]

Mr. Graves:

Certainly. In the 2003 timeframe, a large group of Boeing contractors were operating near one of the launch facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base when they observed a very large, 100-yard-sided red square approach the base from the ocean and hover at low altitude over one of the launch facilities.

[1:02:45 -> 1:03:09]

Mr. Graves:

This object remained for about 45 seconds before darting off over the mountains. There was a similar event within 24 hours later in the

evening. This was a morning event, I believe at 8:45 in the morning. Later in the evening, post-sunset, there were reports of other sightings on base, including some aggressive behaviors. These objects were approaching some of the security guards at rapid speeds before darting off.

[1:03:09 -> 1:03:45]

Mr. Graves:

This information was received through one of the witnesses that approached me at Americans for Safe Aerospace. Was this documented in any official form, whether it was a police blotter?

[1:03:45 -> 1:03:45]

Mr. Graves:

Yes, they had official documentation and records from the event.

[1:03:46 -> 1:07:12]

Representative:

You mentioned that you have witnessed certain phenomena over the years. I'm not going to ask you to sketch it right now for time reasons, but would you be able to describe what you saw? Have you encountered anything similar on other equipment or during your flight time?

Witness:

I have not seen what they described. This object was estimated to be almost the size of a football field, and I have not personally seen anything that large.

Representative:

I have a follow-up question regarding the gimbal video and the Go Fast incident. Can you clarify what happens at the end of that video? Our understanding is that the footage was cut off at a certain point.

Witness:

Certainly. There was some uncertainty or instability with the object; it seemed to rock a bit, and that's the last I saw in the video. Much of the data I would recommend analyzing consists of radar data, which would provide precise kinematics on the object as well as the fleet of objects operating nearby.

Representative:

In regards to the reporting procedures that Mr. Garcia and Representative Burchett addressed with the FAA, to your understanding, are commercial airline pilots receiving cease and desist letters from corporations for coming forward with information regarding safety for potential airline passengers?

Witness:

I have been privy to conversations with commercial aviators who have received cease and desist orders. The American public should know that corporations are prioritizing their reputations over the safety of the American people. Would you agree with that statement?

Representative:
I would agree.

Representative:
This will be my last question as I am out of time. I yield back.

Chairman:
Thank you, Mr. Moskowitz.

Mr. Moskowitz:
Gentlemen, let's talk about the laws of physics for a moment. Mr. Graves and Commander Fravor, I heard you discuss speed. When those objects broke the sound barrier, did they produce a sonic boom?

Witness:
When I was in a jet, you can't hear anything; it's quite loud in there.

Witness:
Yes, you're not able to personally tell within the vehicle. I will say that the objects we observed were spherical and were seen traveling up to Mach 2, which is a very non-aerodynamic shape.

Representative:
What about g-forces? Could a human survive those g-forces with known technology today?

Witness:
No, not for the acceleration rates that we observed.

Representative:
What about the appearance of the objects? How close did you get? Did you see any seams, rivets, or sections? I mean, obviously, the jets you're flying have those features. Did these objects have any?

Witness:
I didn't have the detail to determine that. We got within a halved distance of the Tic Tac, which people say is pretty far, but in aviation, that's actually relatively close. It was perfectly white and smooth, with no windows. However, when we took the original FLIR video that is out there and displayed it on a big screen, it actually showed two small objects that came out from the bottom of it. Other than that, there were no windows, seams, or anything.

Representative:
Mr. Grusch, as a result of your previous government work, have you met with individuals who have direct knowledge of non-human origin craft?

Witness:
Yes, I have personally interviewed those individuals.

Representative:
Mr. Grusch, have you met with people who have direct knowledge of

advanced technologies that the U.S. government possesses?

Witness:

Yes, based on conventional advanced technology.

[1:07:16 -> 1:11:03]

Speaker:

I was briefed on the preponderance of the Defense Department's space and aerospace compartment programs. Do you have knowledge or reason to believe that there are programs in the advanced tech space that are unsanctioned?

[1:07:24]

Witness:

Yes, I do.

[1:07:31]

Speaker:

When you say that they're above congressional oversight, what do you mean?

[1:07:38]

Witness:

That's a complicated question. There is some abuse regarding congressional oversight of conventional special access programs. For example, Title 10 of the U.S. Code, Section 119 discusses congressional oversight of SAPs and the Department of Defense's ability to waive congressional reporting. However, the Gang of Eight is at least supposed to be notified if a waived or acknowledged SAP is created, and that's public law.

[1:08:10]

Speaker:

How does a program like that get funded?

[1:08:14]

Witness:

I can provide generalities, but I can get very specific in a closed session. It involves a misappropriation of funds.

[1:08:22]

Speaker:

Does that mean there is money in the budget that is said to go to a program, but it doesn't, and it goes to something else?

[1:08:27]

Witness:

Yes, I have specific knowledge of that.

[1:08:30]

Speaker:

Do you think U.S. corporations are overcharging for certain technology they're selling to the U.S. government, and that additional money is going to programs?

[1:08:35]

Witness:

Correct, through something called IRAD.

[1:08:41]

Speaker:

Let's talk about satellite imagery. We have satellites all over the place, some that we're aware of and many that we're not. We're taking pictures of everything at every moment. Mr. Grush, are you aware, do you have direct knowledge, or have you talked to people with direct knowledge that there is satellite imagery of these events?

[1:09:01]

Witness:

That was one of my primary tasks at NGA. We process, exploit, and disseminate that kind of information. I've seen multiple cases, some of which, to my understanding, I left NGA in April, so that's my information cutoff date. But I personally reviewed both what we call overhead collection and information from other strategic and tactical platforms that I could not even explain prosaically. I have a degree in physics, by the way, and I am aware that you have not seen these reports. Unfortunately, I don't know why that is.

[1:09:40]

Speaker:

Do you have direct knowledge? We've spoken to people with direct knowledge that this imagery applies to crash sites, crash imagery?

[1:09:44]

Witness:

I can't discuss that in an open session.

[1:09:51]

Speaker:

Do you have any information that the U.S. government is involved in a disinformation campaign to deny the existence of certain UAPs?

[1:10:04]

Witness:

I can't go beyond what I've already stated publicly in my News Nation interview because it touches on other sensitivities.

[1:10:11]

Speaker:

I'll yield the balance of my time back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[1:10:16]

Speaker:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank our witnesses for being here today. Mr. Grush, in your sworn testimony, you state that the United States government has retrieved supposedly extraterrestrial spacecraft and other UAP-related artifacts. You go so far as to state that the U.S. is in possession of "non-human spacecraft" and that some of these

artifacts have circulated with defense contractors. Several other former military and intelligence officials have come forward with similar allegations, albeit in non-public settings.

[1:11:05 -> 1:15:13]

Representative:

Dr. Sean Kirkpatrick, the director of AARO, previously testified before Congress that there has been, and I quote, "no credible evidence thus far of extraterrestrial activity or of off-world technology brought to the attention of the office." To your knowledge, is that statement correct?

Witness:

It's not accurate. I believe Dr. Kirkpatrick mentioned he had about 30 individuals that have come to Arrow thus far. A few of those individuals have also come to Arrow that I interviewed, and I know what they provided to Dr. Kirkpatrick and his team. I was able to evaluate that information.

Representative:

Sure, but my understanding is that his statement is accurate. It came from a direct quote, and this contradiction is a perfect example of why we need to inject transparency into our government. For another example, look no further than the pitiful response to the Chinese spy balloon debacle earlier this year. You may remember the mass confusion that ensued when the balloon was first spotted over Montana, four days after it first entered U.S. airspace over Alaska. The Biden administration's initial inability to address the object grew into a continuous series of embarrassments after news of the balloon reached the mainstream media. We were assured that the balloon posed no threat to our security; however, after the balloon was allowed to transit the entire continental United States, fighter jets were scrambled off the coast of South Carolina to shoot it down. This flip-flopping and obfuscation caused needless confusion, fear, and panic across the country.

It's my hope, Mr. Chairman, that this sort of confusion will not be repeated. We should investigate the extent to which elements of our government possess or do not possess information that is of critical value to the American people. We owe it to the citizens of this nation to ensure that our government is transparent and accountable. We must make sure that our government provides answers, and Congress must do its duty to solicit those answers. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

[1:15:13 -> 1:15:13]

Mr. Frost:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In 2022, NASA announced that it was commissioning an independent study team to examine UAPs. The NASA team is comprised of scientists across different fields, as well as former astronauts and pilots. In May, the independent study team held its first public meeting, which included perspectives from NASA senior leaders, as well as perspectives from the Department of Defense and intelligence agencies. The NASA study team is also expected to release

its first report pretty soon, and I think it's safe to say that we all eagerly await its results.

Mr. Graves, how might NASA's research influence the commercial industry regarding safety and UAP?

Mr. Graves:

I think NASA has a big role to play in commercial aviation and safety, and it's one of their original charges as an organization. One of the recommendations that have been put forward is to utilize their existing aviation safety reporting system to serve as a short-term fill and trusted platform for pilots who want to report on UAP. It also has built-in analytics capability and is funded by Congress.

Mr. Frost:

Gotcha. And also, Mr. Graves, are there any other industries that may be influenced by NASA's research on UAPs? If so, how?

Mr. Graves:

Well, I think there is a large swath of commercial capabilities that could be brought to bear on this topic, from space-based or ground-based sensor systems that are available open source or through commercial marketplaces.

[1:15:16 -> 1:19:00]

Chairman:

NASA's work as they work to identify and highlight U.S. Navy pilots that recorded footage in 2021. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence released a preliminary report on UAP events. NASA Administrator Bill Nelson stated that NASA would begin to investigate these events. In fact, I sit on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and when we were doing a hearing with NASA Administrator Bill Nelson, I asked him why NASA needed to be fully funded. There were many great reasons, but one of them was actually related to UAPs. He mentioned, "Is there life out there? I don't know." Either way, these actions ultimately led NASA to assemble the independent study team that I mentioned earlier. Also, in 2021, Harvard University established the Galileo Project to research and examine the origins of UAPs. It seems like both NASA and the higher education community, because of the work that you all have done, are beginning to see some of that stigma slowly dissipate. Mr. Freyr, do you believe that military pilots feeling empowered to share their UAP experiences has directly impacted the scientific community's research goals on this topic?

Mr. Freyr:

I would say yes. Starting in 2017, when it actually came out, it took that stigma away. I have talked to multiple senators who said that prior to that, if you mentioned UAP, you would have been laughed off the hill. Now, we are sitting here today for a public testimony on what is actually going on. I hope that this curve will be more exponential and that we will see increasing transparency to the level that we can. It's important. I couldn't imagine, you know, I'm not a pilot, but I used to fly gliders in the Civil Air Patrol. I couldn't

imagine being in the glider and seeing something and then not feeling like I had the agency to talk about it.

Mr. Graves:

Can you discuss the importance of seeking scientists to sit on your advisory board?

Mr. Freyr:

Absolutely. I think ultimately this is going to be a scientific problem, and not only that, it's also an engineering problem. I've been working with the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics to help them establish a UAP integration committee to help integrate their engineering expertise into this problem. Yes, I believe this is as much an engineering and scientific problem as it is a national security issue. How might Congress help facilitate partnerships between the scientific community and the UAP focus groups within government?

Mr. Graves:

One of the things they can do is to have these types of hearings to communicate to the public that this is a topic of interest. I think there is a pseudo-market, if you will, of interested capabilities and talent that want to approach this topic, and we're starting to see that grow now. Continued conversation and reduction of stigma will allow that to flourish and help generate answers.

Chairman:

Thank you all for being here, and thank you for your work. I think it's important that we keep our top scientific minds focused on this issue and look for ways to increase collaboration. Thank you so much. I yield back.

Mr. Comer:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me say I want to thank you for having this hearing, and I want to thank Mr. Burchett and Ms. Luna for leading this hearing. With that, I yield my five minutes to Mr. Burchett.

Mr. Burchett:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to direct this, I believe, to Mr. Grush, but if any of you feel like you need to jump in, just jump right in. We're good.

[1:19:03 -> 1:22:38]

Congressman:

As a U.S. government, have we become aware of actual evidence of extraterrestrial or otherwise unexplained forms of intelligence? If so, when do you think this first occurred?

I prefer to use the term "non-human" as it keeps the aperture open both scientifically. Certainly, as I've discussed publicly before, this dates back to the 1930s.

Can you provide the names and titles of the individuals with direct first-hand knowledge and access to some of these crash retrieval

programs? Additionally, which military bases would house the recovered material? I know a lot of Congress has talked about Area 51, but there's nothing there anymore. As soon as we announce it, I'm sure the moving vans would pull up.

I can't discuss that publicly, but I have provided that information to both the Intel committees and the Inspector General. We could discuss that in a skiff if we were allowed to. Would that be appropriate?

Sure, if you had the appropriate access. What special access programs cover this information, and how is it possible that they have evaded oversight for so long?

I do know the names, but once again, I can't discuss that publicly. In a closed setting, I can tell you the specific tradecraft used.

When do you think those programs began, and who authorized them?

I have a lot of that information, but it's something I can't discuss publicly. Since many of you want to jump in on this, you're more than welcome to.

What level of security clearance is required to fully access these programs?

Well, anyone who has... and I say that because myself, representing Gates and Representative Luna, were turned away at one point at Eglin. So please, go right ahead. There is certainly a difference between member access and someone like me. But anyone who has a TSSCI clearance and meets the eligibility criteria should be able to gain access.

Ms. Merchant, if you'll yield, just to clarify, there's nothing that you're aware of that is above special access program classification? If there is anything above Top Secret, Executive Order 13526 delineates the classification levels. I want to emphasize that we can have access to those programs, and the notion that we are not being given that access defies our typical muscle memory here in Congress. Thank you, Ms. Merchant. I'll go back to you. Thank you, Mr. Gates.

Along those lines, Title 10 you might not know this but Title 10 and Title 50 authorization seem to be inefficient. Who gets to decide this, in your opinion?

It's a group of career senior executive officials.

Are they government officials?

Both in and out of government.

That leads to my next question: which private corporations are directly involved in this program, and how much taxpayer money has been invested in these programs to your knowledge?

We know we audit the Pentagon every year, and I've been here five years. They have failed that audit every year. I estimate they lose over a billion dollars a year, and I've told the Department of Defense that maybe 60 percent of their assets are unaccounted for.

[1:22:39 -> 1:26:32]

Speaker:

In the public sector, you can go to jail for that kind of misconduct. So tell me, when I am a dollar off on my DTS travel voucher, I get penalized. However, it seems like it doesn't work the same way for corporations. If you sell over \$600 worth of items on eBay, you receive a call from the IRS. What about corporations? I don't have the specific metrics regarding your question. I did provide details to the committees in specific divisions, and I spent eleven and a half hours with both Intel committees.

Has there been an active U.S. government disinformation campaign to deny the existence of unidentified aerial phenomena? If so, why? I can't go beyond what I've already publicly exposed about that.

Okay, I've been instructed to ask you what that is and how to get it on the record. What have you stated publicly in your interviews for the Congressional Record?

If you reference my News Nation interview, I discuss a multi-decade campaign to disenfranchise public interest. Thank you. I apologize, Mr. Chairman. I yield back negative 21 seconds.

Thank you, Mrs. Ocasio-Cortez.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to our witnesses for being here today. I concur with the ranking member and several other members of this committee that this is a committee for whistleblowers and for the protection of whistleblowers as well. We understand what you are putting on the table and what you are risking, and we thank you for that.

Mr. Crush, you sat on the Unidentified Anomalous Phenomenon Task Force created in the 2020 NDAA, correct?

Yes. There have been some points mentioned during this hearing that I wanted to address.

Mr. Graves, you specifically mentioned during your response to one of the questions that Boeing contractors were involved in an incident regarding this Red Cube, which was about the size of a football field. Could you elaborate on the interactions between defense contractor companies and NAUAP-related programs or activities?

I can say that the information about the contractors was provided by a witness, and I do not have specific details about that relationship.

Mr. Gresh?

In general terms, the contractors, or the "metal benders," are the ones actually performing on government contracts. Are they required to disclose any information regarding UAP sightings, or do they engage in any reporting related to this?

Not that I am aware of; they do not.

Now, regarding the notification you mentioned about the IRAP program, we have seen defense contractors abuse their contracts before through this committee. I have witnessed it personally, and I have also seen the notification requirements to Congress abused.

I am wondering, one of the loopholes we see in the law, from my perspective, is that there are no actual definitions or requirements for notification. Are there? What methods of notification did you observe? When they say they notified Congress, how did they do that? Do you have any insight into that?

For certain IRAD activities, I can only think of conventional methods.

[1:26:34 -> 1:29:59]

Speaker 1:

Sometimes they flow through certain, I would say, SAP programs that have cognizant authority over the Air Force or something. Those are congressionally reported compartments. But IRED is literally internal to the contractor, so as long as it's money either profits, private investment, etc. they can do whatever they want. To put a finer point on it, when there is a requirement for any agency or company to notify Congress, do they contact the chairman of a committee? Do they get them on the phone specifically? Is this through an email to, hypothetically, a dead email box? A lot of it comes through what they call the PPR, or Periodic Program Review process, if it's a SAP or controlled access program equity. Then those go to the specific committees, whether it be the SAS, Cask, or others. Thank you.

Speaker 2:

I apologize, my time is limited. Mr. Graves, one of your main concerns is that the FAA currently does not have an official process to receive reports of UAP from pilots or others, correct?

Mr. Graves:

Correct.

Speaker 2:

In your experience, what data should the Aero program prioritize for potential collection? We have location, date, and time, but are there other specific active characteristics that should be included in these reports?

Mr. Graves:

Certainly. I think there are two categories that would be important. One would be kinematics, understanding the specifics of how the vehicle or objects are moving. The second would be a more zoomed-out approach, being able to look at origin and destination before and after the incident, as well as getting a better contextual understanding of how these objects interact with each other. Thank you.

Speaker 2:

Now, because I only have a minute left, I apologize. We only have five minutes today, but for the record, if you were me, where would you look titles, programs, departments, regions? If you could just name anything, I put that as an open question to the three of you.

Mr. Graves:

I'd be happy to give you that in a closed environment. I can tell you specifically. Thank you.

Commander Fraver:

I would say, and I've told people, you have to know where to look. They're not going to divulge it to you because of classification levels, but if you know where to look and who to talk to which is exactly Mr. Graves' point then you have them.

Mr. Graves:

I was an operator, so I was depending on folks like Mr. Graves to do that homework. Thank you very much. I yield back to the chair.

Mr. Biggs:

Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I thank the witnesses for being here today. I'm over here. Thank you so much for being here.

Speaker 2:

I want to get into specifics here, and the reason I'm going to go this way is because you've talked a bit about what I would call misdirection by the official U.S. government with regard to UAPs, right? So I'm going to get to that in a second. But last week, White House spokesman John Kirby stated that UAPs are having an impact on our training ranges and need to be treated as a legitimate issue. Do you concur with the statements? That's for each of you.

All witnesses:

Yes. Yes. Yes.

Speaker 2:

Now, having said that, I'm going to take you to specific instances around the...

[1:30:01 -> 1:33:29]

Speaker:

I live in Phoenix Valley, and in 1997, we had the famous Phoenix Lights case. I don't know if any of you are familiar with that. There were two things that went along with that, and the explanation was military training exercises off Luke Air Force Base and the Barry Goldwater Range. Do you know anything different from the official explanation of those lights?

Speaker:

Only what's in the public domain about it. That was outside the scope of my duties. If we wanted to find out more about that, where would we go to find the files, and who would we address? I know you can tell me we need to go to a skiff, so you can tell us in a skiff.

Speaker:

I could potentially give you a vector on that specific case. I'm familiar with it in terms of public knowledge, but I can provide you with a vector in a closed environment.

Speaker:

That would be good, thank you. So, if it's true that UAPs are having an impact on training ranges and this Administration considers it a

legitimate issue, what steps can Congress take to address training range impacts? I mention this because I have two very large training ranges in my state. We'll start with Mr. Gravesen and go down the panel.

Speaker:

Some initial procedures have been implemented, such as within the United States Navy, which has a range value report that gathers information from pilots. I understand that a service-wide reporting mechanism is still pending; however, that would be a great next step, not only for gathering information but also for showing the troops that this is an acceptable topic and reducing the stigma.

Speaker:

Please, all of you continue. As a recipient of many of those training range reports, sometimes we only receive contextual oral reporting. It would be beneficial if they attached all sensor data and established a system that can handle multiple classifications of data. This is an issue with the F-35; that jet was never built to be an ISR platform, and it's quite challenging to extract that data.

Speaker:

Yes, I would agree with the previous two speakers. As a user of those training ranges, the data must be out there. You have to acknowledge that you're seeing these phenomena, and then you have to collect the data. Right now, you receive a report where someone says they saw something, but no one collects the radar data to back it up and conduct research.

Speaker:

Do you believe that the 2019 classification guidelines for UAPs interfere with the federal government's ability to be transparent with the American people? Do you think we need to be more transparent with the American public?

Speaker:

Yes, I would say yes to that. I'm familiar with the UAP Task Force's 2019 security classification guide. I think it's fair. I did actually help author that, so I may have a bias. However, I will say a bit about declassifying videos. I've seen some of the videos of the recent shootdowns, and I saw no reason that they couldn't have been released, as long as they masked certain data. The American people deserve to see that imagery and full-motion video.

Speaker:

In my opinion, I believe things are overclassified. I know for a fact that the video or the pictures that came out in the 2018 and 2020 reports, which featured incidents off the east coast, were taken with an iPhone. A buddy of mine was one of the senior people involved, and he mentioned that they were originally classified as TSSCI.

[1:33:32 -> 1:37:19]

Representative:

The question to him was, what's TSSCI about these? They're an iPhone,

right? Literally off the vacapes. That's not TSSCI. So, they're overclassified, and as soon as they do that, they go in a vault, and then you all have to look for them. With the overclassification, that may be one way. Are there other ways that the Department of Defense or intelligence agencies are keeping this information from the American people or even from Congress?

I think part of that has been not encouraging reporting. If the problem is not something that can be measured, it's not something that's going to be fixed.

Okay, very good. I'm out of time, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know you'll...

First of all, without objection, Representative Nick Langworthy of New York has waived on to the subcommittee for the purpose of questioning witnesses in today's subcommittee hearing. Now we go to Mr. Burleson.

Mr. Burleson:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate you all coming out today to testify. Look, I've been here for six months, and I'm pretty skeptical. I don't trust anything in this town, and I think that's because I'm from Missouri you've got to show me, right?

With that being said, there's been a lot of things that have been said in the public, Mr. Crush, and so I want to get down to some specifics, if we can.

At one point, you had said that there has been harmful activity or progressive activity. Has any of the activity been aggressive or hostile in your reports?

I know of multiple colleagues of mine who got physically injured by the activity, and I gotta say, by UAPs or by people within the federal government both.

Okay, so there has been activity by alien or non-human technology and/or beings that has caused harm to humans?

I can't get into the specifics in an open environment, but at least the activity that I personally witnessed and I have to be very careful here because they tell you never to acknowledge tradecraft what I personally witnessed myself and my wife was very disturbing.

One of my constituents actually sent this next question, and I figured I'd ask it since I had the same thought. You've said that the U.S. has intact spacecraft. You said that the government has alien bodies or alien species. Have you seen the spacecraft?

I have to be careful to describe what I've seen firsthand and not in this environment, but I could answer that question behind closed doors.

And have you seen any of the bodies?

That's something I've not witnessed myself.

Okay, and so with that being said, the other statement that has been made was intriguing to me because my view has been that we are billions of light-years away from any other system. The concept that an alien species that's technologically advanced enough to travel billions of light-years gets here and somehow is incompetent enough to not survive Earth or crashes is something that I find a little bit far-fetched. With that being said, you have mentioned that there's interdimensional potential. Could you expound on that?

Oh yeah, to answer your first question, and you know I'm here as a fact witness and an expert, but I will give you a theoretical framework at least to work off to kind of expose crashes.

[1:37:22 -> 1:41:24]

Speaker:

Regardless of your level of sentience, planes crash, cars crash, and a small percentage of sorties will end in mission failure, as we say in the Air Force. In terms of multi-dimensionality, the framework I'm familiar with is called the holographic principle. It derives from general relativity and quantum mechanics. If you imagine 3D objects, such as yourself, casting a shadow onto a 2D surface, that illustrates the holographic principle. You can be quasi-projected from higher-dimensional space to lower-dimensional space. It's a scientific trope that you can actually cross, as far as I understand. However, I have not seen any documentation that confirms this is occurring; it remains a theoretical framework discussion.

Okay, Occam's razor suggests that these aircraft have not been identified as being produced by domestic military or contractors. Is there any evidence that what is being recovered is of domestic origin? Not to my knowledge. Additionally, the recoveries predate many of our advanced programs that I am aware of.

would it be safe to say that there could be a scenario today where an aircraft crashes, and because it has been involved in one program from one federal agency, the agency that retrieves it is unaware of that program, leading them to believe it appears alien in origin? That is a hypothetical situation. I am not aware of any historical situation that matches what you described. So, you are not aware of it having happened? Not to my knowledge.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Several months ago, my office received a protected disclosure from Eglin Air Force Base indicating that there was a UAP incident that required my attention. I sought a briefing regarding that episode and brought with me Congressman Burchett and Congresswoman Luna. We asked to see any evidence that had been collected by the flight crew during this endeavor, including radar signatures, and to meet with the flight crew. Initially, we were not afforded access to all of the flight

crew, nor were we granted access to images and radar data. After some discussion about how authorities flow in the United States, we did see the image and met with one member of the flight crew who took the image. The image depicted something that I cannot attribute to any human capability, either from the United States or from any of our adversaries. I am somewhat informed on the matter, having served on the Armed Services Committee for seven years and on the committee that oversees DARPA and advanced technologies for several years.

When we spoke with the flight crew and he showed us the photo he had taken, I asked why the video wasn't engaged and why we didn't have a FLIR system that worked. Here's what he said: they were out on a test mission that day over the Gulf of Mexico, and when you're on a test mission, you're supposed to have clear airspace there shouldn't be anything that shows up. They observed a sequence of four craft in a clear diamond formation, for which there is a radar sequence that I alone have observed in the United States Congress. One of the pilots went to check out that diamond formation and saw a large...

[1:41:26 -> 1:45:12]

Commander Fravor:

I witnessed what I can only describe as an orb, again, not of any human capability that I'm aware of. When he approached, he said that his radar went down. He mentioned that his FLIR system malfunctioned and that he had to manually take this image from one of the lenses; it was not automated as you would typically see in a test mission. So, I guess I'll start with Commander Fravor. How should we think about the fact that this craft, which was approached by our pilot, had the capability of disarming a number of the sensor and collection systems on that craft?

I think this goes to the National Security side. You can go back through history and see instances where things have shown up in certain areas and disabled our capabilities, which is disheartening. For us, it completely disabled the radar and aircraft when I tried to do it. The only way we could see it was passively, which is how he got that image. So, I think that's a concern regarding what these crafts are doing, not only how they operate but also their capabilities to do things like this.

How should we think about four crafts moving in a very clear formation, equidistant from one another in a diamond shape? Mr. Grusch, have we ever seen multiple crafts in a single formation?

Mr. Grusch:

I have one particular case, and that was during the Gimbal incident. The recording on the FLIR system shows a single object that rotates. You hear the pilots refer to a fleet of objects that is not visible on the FLIR system, and that was something I witnessed during the debrief as part of the radar data on the situational awareness page.

I would like to add, Congressman, that there is a small bit of anger I feel regarding the fact that those pilots are still facing difficulties in reporting this topic. They don't have the tools to

mitigate this issue. It just goes to show how serious this is and why it is such an important issue for our pilots and for our nation. It was stated explicitly to me by these test pilots that if you have a UAP experience, the best thing you can do for your career is to forget it and not tell anyone. Any type of reporting, whether above the surface or below, has perceived consequences for these individuals, and that is a culture we must change if we want to get to the truth.

Mr. Chairman, I would observe that as we move forward from this hearing, there are some obvious next steps. Every person watching this knows that we need to meet with Mr. Grusch in a secure compartmentalized facility so that we can get full answers that do not put him in jeopardy and that provide us with the information we need.

Second, I would suggest that the radar images collected of this formation of crafts out of Eglin Air Force Base, specifically the actual image taken by the flight crew, be provided to the committee, subpoenaed if necessary, so that we can track how to get this type of reporting and analysis done in a more comprehensive way. That would be my humble recommendation as a guest here of the fine oversight committee. I yield back.

Ms. Mace:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to our witnesses who are testifying today. I want to thank each of you for being here to discuss a topic of grave importance to our national security. Earlier this year, a Chinese spy balloon was shot down off the coast of my home state of South Carolina. Since the Roswell incident in 1947, many Americans have wondered about the dangers of...

[1:45:13 -> 1:48:43]

Committee Member:

There are unknown objects crisscrossing our skies. Whether these are UAPs, weather phenomena, advanced technology from American allied or enemy forces, or something more out of this world, is still unclear. My first question I'll have several questions, and if we can be quick on these first two, I'll ask each of you the same question, and then I'll get to each of you individually. The first one: when you reported your experiences with a UAP, did any of you face repercussions from your superiors? Yes or no?

Witness 1:

No.

Witness 2:

I've actually never seen anything, believe it or not.

Committee Member:

Alright. And do you believe there's an active disinformation campaign within our government to deny the existence of UAPs? Yes or no?

Witness 1:

I don't have an answer to that.

Witness 2:

As previously stated publicly, yes. I think previously, with Project Blue Book, yes, but currently, I don't speak for the United States government.

Committee Member:

Okay, thank you. I have a few questions for Mr. Graves. What percentage of UAP sightings, in your belief, go unreported by our pilots?

Mr. Graves:

This is an approximation based on my personal experience speaking with a number of pilots, but I would estimate we're somewhere near five percent reporting. So, about 95 percent essentially don't report seeing UAPs. That's just my personal estimate.

Committee Member:

In the incident off Virginia Beach, do you believe the Navy took the danger to your aircraft seriously after it was reported?

Mr. Graves:

Absolutely.

Committee Member:

A few questions for Mr. Favor. As an expert naval aviator, have you ever seen an object that looked and moved like the Tic Tac UAP?

Mr. Favor:

No.

Committee Member:

Did the Tic Tac UAP move in such a way that defied the laws of physics as we understand them?

Mr. Favor:

Yes.

Committee Member:

Many dismiss UAP reports as classified weapons testing by our own government, but in your experience as a pilot, does our government typically test advanced weapon systems right next to multi-million dollar jets without informing our pilots?

Mr. Favor:

No, we have test ranges for that.

Committee Member:

It took over 15 years for your encounter with the Tic Tac to be declassified. Do you feel there was a good reason to prevent lawmakers from having access to this footage?

Mr. Favor:

No, I just think it was ignored when it happened and it just sat

somewhere in a file and never got reported. It happens a lot up here.

Committee Member:

Mr. Gresh, a couple of questions for you too, sir. This morning, what percentage of UAPs do you feel are adequately investigated by the U.S. government of the five percent that are reported?

Mr. Gresh:

I can only speak for my personal leadership over at NGA. I tried to look at every report that came through that I could triage.

Committee Member:

Do you believe that officials at the highest levels of our national security apparatus have unlawfully withheld information from Congress and subverted our oversight authority?

Mr. Gresh:

There are certain elected leaders that had more information than I'm not sure what they've shared with certain Gang of Eight members, etc. But certainly, I would not be surprised.

Committee Member:

You've stated that the government is in possession of potentially non-human spacecraft. Based on your experience and extensive conversations with experts, do you believe our government has made contact with intelligent extraterrestrials?

Mr. Gresh:

That's something I can't discuss in a public setting.

Committee Member:

Okay, and I can't ask when you think this occurred if you believe we have crashed craft. As stated earlier, do we...

[1:48:46 -> 1:52:20]

Speaker:

We have the bodies of the pilots who piloted this craft. As I've stated publicly already in my News Nation interview, biologics came with some of these recoveries.

Interviewer:

Were they, I guess, human or non-human biologics?

Speaker:

Non-human, and that was the assessment of people with direct knowledge of the program I talked to who are currently still on the program.

Interviewer:

And was this documented evidence, such as video, photos, or eyewitness accounts? How would that be determined?

Speaker:

The specific documentation I would have to discuss with you in a

skiff.

Interviewer:

Okay, so you may or may not be able to answer my last question, and maybe we can get into a skiff at the next hearing we have. But who in the government what agency, sub-agency, or contractors should be called into the next hearing about UAPs, either in a public or private setting? You probably can't name names, but what agencies or organizations, contractors, etc., do we need to call in to get these questions answered, whether it's about funding, what programs are happening, and what's out there?

Speaker:

I can provide you with a specific cooperative and hostile witness list of individuals that were involved.

Interviewer:

How soon can we get that list?

Speaker:

I'm happy to provide that to you after the hearing.

Interviewer:

Super, thank you, and I yield back.

[1:50:07 -> 1:50:16]

Interviewer:

Okay, now we have Mr. Langworthy here.

[1:50:16 -> 1:50:23]

Interviewer:

Thank you very much. I'd like to thank all of the witnesses for being here today to discuss this very unique topic. I'd like to jump right into my questions, if you don't mind. Commander Fraver, can you briefly describe your background?

[1:50:25 -> 1:50:41]

Commander Fraver:

Yes, I was an enlisted Marine, a Naval Academy graduate, and I flew for the Navy for 18 years. I have a master's degree from the University of Houston, and I've worked in the private sector for the last 16 to 17 years, focusing on defense work.

[1:50:43 -> 1:50:52]

Interviewer:

So, you have quite impressive credentials. Commander Fraver, we have all seen the floating Tic Tac video that you engaged with on November 14, 2004. Can you briefly talk about why you were off the coast of San Diego that day?

[1:50:54 -> 1:51:25]

Commander Fraver:

We were conducting a workup with all the battle groups, integrating the ships with the carrier and the air wing. We were performing air

defense to hone our skills, as well as those of the USS Princeton, which had been tracking these objects for two weeks. The problem was that there were never any manned aircraft airborne when they were tracking them, and this was the first day we were able to engage and actually see it.

[1:51:26 -> 1:51:31]

Interviewer:

Do you remember the weather that day? Was it cloudy, windy, or anything out of the ordinary on the Pacific coast?

[1:51:32 -> 1:51:41]

Commander Fraver:

It was actually a perfect day, if you're familiar with San Diego light winds, no whitecaps, and clear skies. There wasn't a cloud in the sky; it was the best day for flying.

[1:51:41 -> 1:51:49]

Interviewer:

Is it true that you saw, in your words, a 40-foot flying Tic Tac-shaped object?

[1:51:49 -> 1:51:53]

Commander Fraver:

That's correct. For some people who may not know what a Tic Tac is, it's essentially a giant flying propane tank.

[1:51:53 -> 1:52:07]

Interviewer:

Fair enough. Did this object come up on radar or interfere with your radar or the USS Princeton?

[1:52:07 -> 1:52:20]

Commander Fraver:

The Princeton tracked it, the Nimitz tracked it, and the E2 tracked it. We never saw it on our radars; our fire control radar never picked it up. The other airplane that took the video did get it on radar, but as soon as it tried to lock onto it, the object jammed the radar, causing the lock to fail. The pilot rapidly switched over to the targeting pod, which can be done in the F-18.

[1:52:22 -> 1:55:57]

Speaker 1:

Can you provide information on the source of propulsion from the flying object, including any potential thermal scans from your aircraft?

[1:52:29]

Speaker 2:

No, there are none. There's no infrared plume coming out. Chad, who took the video, went through all the electro-optical modes, which include black and white TV and infrared modes, and there are no visual signs of propulsion. It's just sitting in space at twenty thousand feet.

[1:52:41]

Speaker 1:

In your career, have you ever seen a propulsion system that creates no thermal exhaust?

[1:52:45]

Speaker 2:

No.

[1:52:48]

Speaker 1:

Can you describe how the aircraft maneuvered?

[1:52:51]

Speaker 2:

It maneuvered abruptly and very determinately. It knew exactly what it was doing. It was aware of our presence and had acceleration rates that were astonishing. It went from zero to matching our speed in no time at all.

[1:53:04]

Speaker 1:

Now, if the fastest plane on Earth were trying to perform the maneuvers that you observed, would it be capable of doing that?

[1:53:11]

Speaker 2:

No, not even close.

[1:53:14]

Speaker 1:

And just to confirm, this object had no wings, correct?

[1:53:19]

Speaker 2:

Correct, no wings.

[1:53:21]

Speaker 1:

Now, was the aircraft that you were flying armed?

[1:53:23]

Speaker 2:

No, I never felt threatened at all.

[1:53:26]

Speaker 1:

If the aircraft had been armed, do you believe that your aircraft or any aircraft in the possession of the United States could have shot the Tic Tac down?

[1:53:36]

Speaker 2:

I d say no, just based on its performance. It would have just left in a split second.

[1:53:43]

Speaker 1:

It looks like we have a problem here that needs further investigation.

[1:53:49]

Speaker 2:

Yes.

[1:53:51]

Speaker 1:

In your belief, is this flying Tic Tac capable of being the product of any other nation on Earth?

[1:54:03]

Speaker 2:

No. As I said earlier, I think it defies current material science and the ability to develop that much propulsion. I know there have been some physicists who have done calculations that are beyond anything we have.

[1:54:15]

Speaker 1:

well, either the United States has an adversary here in this world that we don t know about, or we really have some serious investigations to do. I really appreciate you being here.

[1:54:26]

Speaker 2:

Is there anything else about the November 14, 2004 incident that you think is important for this committee to know that you haven t been asked here today?

[1:54:33]

Speaker 1:

No, I think it s been said that it s probably the most credible UFO sighting in history based on all the sensors that were tracking it. For us to get visual confirmation and to counter the naysayers, it s significant. There were four sets of human eyeballs involved, and all six of us who were part of this incident, including the video, have over twenty years of military experience in very responsible positions. I d say the world needs to know that this is not a joke.

[1:55:03]

Speaker 2:

Thank you very much for your testimony here today. I yield back.

[1:55:07]

Speaker 3:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for being here and for the courage it took to come forward, as well as the sacrifices each of you

has made.

[1:55:19]

Speaker 3:

I serve on the National Security Subcommittee for the Financial Services Committee, so I really want to stay in the national security lane, if I may. When we think about traditional adversaries, both in terms of our actions towards them and theirs towards us, we probe their capabilities, look for weaknesses, and collect reconnaissance data for potential future needs.

[1:55:43]

Speaker 3:

For each of you, yes or no, based on your own experience or the data you have been privy to: Is there any indication that these UAPs could be essentially collecting reconnaissance information?

[1:55:47]

Speaker 4:

Mr. Graves?

[1:56:00 -> 1:59:59]

Mr. Grush:

Yes, Mr. Grush. Fair assessment?

Mr. Fraver:

Very possible.

Mr. Grush:

Again, in the context of national security, is it possible that these UAPs would be probing our capabilities? Yes or no?

Mr. Graves:

Yes.

Mr. Grush:

Yes.

Mr. Fraver:

Definitely.

Mr. Grush:

Is it possible that these UAPs are testing for vulnerabilities in our current systems?

Mr. Graves:

Yes.

Mr. Grush:

Yes, possible.

Mr. Grush:

Do you feel, based on your experience and the information that you've been privy to, that these UAPs pose an existential threat to the

national security of the United States?

Mr. Graves:
Potentially, yes, sir.

Mr. Grush:
Potentially?

Mr. Fraver:
Yeah, I'd say definitely potentially.

Mr. Grush:
And in the event that your encounters became hostile, would you have had the capability to defend yourself, your crew, or your aircraft?

Mr. Fraver:
Absolutely not, sir. No.

Mr. Grush:
Based on the information that you've been privy to, is there any indication that these UAPs are interested in our nuclear technology and capabilities?

Mr. Graves:
Yes.

Mr. Grush:
By external observation, sure, that could be a fair assessment.

Mr. Grush:
Is there any indication that the Department of Energy is involved in UAP data collection and housing?

Mr. Graves:
I don't have an answer. I can't confirm or deny that in a public setting.

Mr. Grush:
Could you do it in a secure setting?

Mr. Graves:
Yes.

Mr. Fraver:
No, I don't know.

Mr. Chairman:
Um, you know, I think I'm the last member to go, but there clearly is a threat to the national security of the United States of America. As members of Congress, we have a responsibility to maintain oversight and be aware of these activities so that, if appropriate, we take action. I would encourage the chairman to demand that we have any and all, but in particular, Mr. Grush, talk to us in a skiff. If that access is denied, I will personally volunteer to initiate the Holman

rule against any personnel, program, or agency that denies access to Congress.

Mr. Chairman:

With that, I will yield the remainder of my time to my fellow colleague from Tennessee, Mr. Bircher.

Mr. Bircher:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Ogles, for the great questions, brother.

Mr. Grush:

Um, Mr. Grush, I might have asked this before, but I want to make sure: do you have any personal knowledge of someone who has possibly been injured working on legacy UAP reverse engineering?

Mr. Grush:

Yes.

Mr. Bircher:

Okay.

Mr. Bircher:

Um, how were they injured? Was it something like a radioactive type situation or something we didn't understand? I've heard people talk about Havana syndrome-type incidents. What was your recollection of that?

Mr. Grush:

I can't get into specifics, but you could imagine assessing an unknown unknown. There are a lot of potentialities you can't fully prepare for.

Mr. Bircher:

How do you think we ought to handle UAP whistleblower complaints like yours in the future?

Mr. Grush:

Yeah, there was some issue of mine. So, you know, PPD 19 process goes to the Intel committees, either through PPD 19 or ICD-120. There's not a good way for the intelligence community Inspector General to provide that to other committees. I asked for my information to be sent to the House and Senate Armed Services Committee because there are Title 10 equities at play, but there was no smooth process to do so.

Mr. Grush:

Yeah, it's a trash can.

Mr. Bircher:

Um, are you aware of any individuals that are participating in reverse engineering programs for non-terrestrial craft?

Mr. Grush:

Personally, yes.

Mr. Grush:

Uh, you know anything to be willing to testify if there were protections for...

[2:00:01 -> 2:01:59]

Chairman:

Certainly, closed door and assurances regarding breaking their NDA. They're not going to get administratively punished for that. I yield to Mr. Chair.

Thank you. I'm going to do something a little bit out of the ordinary here. We're going to give three people a chance at an additional three minutes. So, Mr. Merchant, do you want to keep going?

Merchant:

Why don't you come back to me, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman:

Ms. Luna, if she's on the list?

Luna:

Sure, Chairman. I'd like to submit for the record an article by News Nation, which follows Mr. Grush's full interview for the record. Without objection, thank you.

Chairman:

Mr. Grush, why is it that you refer to the phenomenon as non-human intelligence? Why deviate from the basis of extraterrestrial life?

Grush:

I think the phenomenon is very complex, and I like to keep an open mind analytically regarding its specific origin.

Chairman:

When you say specific origin, are you referring to something traditional, like extraterrestrial origin, or something else that we don't quite understand, from either a biological or astrophysical perspective?

Grush:

Yeah, I just like to keep an open mind about what it could be.

Chairman:

Okay, and referring to your News Nation interview, you had referenced specific treaties between governments. Article 3 of the nuclear arms treaty with Russia identifies UAPs; it specifically mentions them. To your knowledge, are there safety measures in place with foreign governments or other superpowers to avoid an escalatory situation in the event that a UAP malevolent event occurs?

Grush:

Yeah, you're referring to an actual public treaty in the U.N. register. It's funny you mention that the agreement on measures to

reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war, signed in 1971.

[2:02:02 -> 2:03:13]

Speaker:

The unclassified treaty is publicly available. If you cite the George Washington University National Security Archives, you will find the declassified information from 2013, including specific provisions and the red line flash message traffic with the specific codes pursuant to Article 3. Additionally, there is a situation two, which is in the previously classified NSA archive. What I would recommend, and I tried to get access but encountered a wall of silence at the White House, is to look into the specific incidents when that message traffic was used. I believe some scholarship on that would open the door to further investigation using the publicly available information. Thank you. My last question, with 51 seconds remaining, is regarding the potential white-collar crimes related to a cover-up. Can you please elaborate? I have concerns based on the interviews I conducted under my official duties regarding potential violations of the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR). Thank you very much, Chairman. I yield the remainder of my time.

[2:03:15 -> 2:03:24]

Chairman:

Okay, we'll go to Mr. Raskin for three minutes.

[2:03:24 -> 2:03:40]

Mr. Raskin:

Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I thank the witnesses for their endurance and service today. Mr. Favor, you've described your episode in detail, calling it the most credible UFO sighting in history. But I wonder, was this the first time you encountered a UFO or a UAP?

[2:03:40 -> 2:03:47]

Mr. Favor:

In 2004, yes.

[2:03:47 -> 2:04:11]

Mr. Raskin:

And what was your general attitude or perspective on the UFO discussion before that happened?

[2:04:11 -> 2:04:04]

Mr. Favor:

I never felt that we were alone with all the planets out there, but I wasn't a UFO person. I wasn't watching the History Channel or MUFON and all that.

[2:04:04 -> 2:04:11]

Mr. Raskin:

Have you had experiences or encounters since that happened?

[2:04:13 -> 2:06:08]

Committee Member:

Have you formed any general conclusions about what you think you

experienced?

[2:04:19 -> 2:04:33]

Witness:

Yes, I believe what we experienced was well beyond the material science and capabilities that we had at the time, as well as what we currently possess or are likely to have in the next 10 to 20 years.

[2:04:34 -> 2:05:10]

Committee Member:

Mr. Grush, you've been able to answer in great detail on certain questions, while on others, you indicate that you cannot respond. Can you explain where you draw the line and the basis for that?

[2:04:37 -> 2:04:55]

Witness:

Based on my security review and what has been determined to be unclassified, I can answer questions that pertain to my knowledge of unclassified matters. However, I cannot comment on classified issues in this open session, though I am willing to participate in a closed session at the appropriate level.

[2:05:11 -> 2:05:41]

Committee Member:

Mr. Graves, you mentioned that there are dozens of fellow military pilots. Are there also commercial pilots who have encountered the same types of sightings you described?

[2:05:13 -> 2:05:35]

Witness:

Yes, commercial pilots have similar experiences, but they have less range and fewer sensors to detect objects over wide swaths of airspace. They typically see these objects when they are closer, and the range of what they observe is quite large.

[2:05:45 -> 2:06:08]

Committee Member:

What is the most vivid, concrete sighting you have had with the naked eye of the objects you described before, particularly the cube-like objects?

[2:05:49 -> 2:06:06]

Witness:

Certainly, the most vivid sighting would have been during a near mid-air incident at the entrance to our working area. One of these objects was completely stationary at the exact entrance to our working area, both geographically and at altitude.

[2:06:11 -> 2:08:01]

Speaker 1:

Where all the jets are going essentially on the Eastern Seaboard, the two aircraft flew within about 50 feet of the object. That was a very close visual sighting. You were in one of the aircraft?

Speaker 2:

I was not. I was there when the pilot landed; he canceled the mission after. I was there; he was in the ready room with all his gear on, his mouth open. I asked him what the problem was, and he said he almost hit one of those darn things. He said he was 50 feet away from it.

Speaker 1:

Yes, sir. And his description of the object was consistent with the description you gave us before: a dark gray or black cube inside of a clear sphere.

Speaker 2:

Yes, and with no self-evident propulsion system, no wings, no infrared energy coming off of the vehicle, nothing tethering it to the ground. That was primarily what we were experiencing out there. I'm over time. Thank you very much for your service, and I'll go back to Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 3:

Very good, Mr. Burchette.

Speaker 4:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is for all three of you, starting with Mr. Grates. Why did you come forward on this issue?

Speaker 5:

I came forward because I felt that my colleagues did not have a way to mitigate the safety threat, and I wanted to help them. I was trained as an aviation safety officer by the Navy, and this seemed it just felt right. I felt like I had to help the folks that were still flying and dealing with this.

Speaker 6:

Mr. Crush?

Speaker 5:

Purely a sense of duty. I first swore an oath when I was a cadet 18 years ago, and I still uphold that even out of the uniform.

Speaker 7:

Commander?

Speaker 5:

I was pestered by a friend, and I asked why. He said, "You're the one person that they can't discredit, and you'll add credibility to the New York Times article." So after about six times, I said okay.

Speaker 8:

Um, this town isn't made, unfortunately, by people like you all.

[2:08:02 -> 2:09:49]

Chairperson:

We thank you, and I also want to thank the people in the audience and those watching this. It can't be easy for people all over the world

who have kept this issue alive. You've endured criticism and derogatory remarks, and we're trying to get to the bottom of it. So, God bless you all. Thank you so much; we really appreciate you.

[Applause]

That's why we need term limits, y'all. Keep clapping; those politicians just keep talking.

Let me ask you all: how can the public contribute to UAP reporting, and what avenues do you think are available for the public to report these sightings?

Right now, I don't think there are many public options for the average person to report this. I think even for professionals who have sensor data and see these on a regular basis, they are still hesitant to come forward. So, for the general public, I believe encouraging the conversations we are having today and looking for technological solutions that can be distributed to gather objective data is the first step.

Mr. Garage, I'll just touch on the whistleblower aspect. I encourage current and former military personnel, members of the intelligence community, and industry contractors to come forward in a legal manner, either through the IC or DOD or whatever the cognizant agencies are, to join me in this discussion.

Commander, I should say for the record that my father was in the United States Marine Corps, First Marine Division. Overall, yes sir, he was old school him and Chesty Puller on the pillow. Thank you, brother. Wow, yes. I'm not anything like my father; he was incredible. I'm very mediocre, to say the least.

But go ahead; you seem to be doing fine.

For me, I was an accident investigator, so the biggest thing I learned...

[2:09:50 -> 2:11:32]

Witness:

Witnesses need to do one thing: don't try to make the fish bigger than it was. Stick to the facts, write it down, and don't speculate about what you think it is. It is for your decision; just write the facts down. We can gather all the facts together, and we can start to investigate and get a real, honest story instead of it being exaggerated. Thank you all. I want to thank everybody; we made history today. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

[2:11:32 -> 2:11:55]

Mr. Garcia:

Thank you very much. I believe we are now going to be making some closing remarks, so I just wanted to say a few things. First, to our witnesses, I want to thank all of you for being here with us today. I know that it takes a lot of courage to share such important

information with this committee, and I want to express my gratitude for your service to our country.

[2:11:55 -> 2:12:20]

Mr. Garcia:

I also want to note that today's hearing was both important and serious. I want to thank our subcommittee chairman, Mr. Groffman, for running a very fair and substantive hearing. I appreciate the committee staff on both sides for the amount of work that it took to organize this hearing, and certainly to all the members who have been involved in this issue prior to the hearing.

[2:12:20 -> 2:12:43]

Mr. Garcia:

I also want to note for our witnesses and for the public that I am a freshman member of Congress, and I've only been here for seven months. However, this has been by far the most bipartisan conversation and discussion that I have seen in Congress. I believe that a topic of this significance, as it relates to our national security and the information we are trying to gather for the American public, does bring people together, and I think that has been really great to see.

[2:11:36 -> 2:13:26]

Ranking Member:

Mr. Raskin and our Vice Ranking Member, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, are both here at our hearing. I think this shows the importance and seriousness that our side of the aisle is taking regarding this important hearing, as well as the broader issue of working with our Republican counterparts on this committee.

I want to additionally add that I believe it is crucial to continue these discussions and hearings. Clearly, there is a lot of information that we do not know, but it is also evident that we must continue our investigation and hold ourselves accountable by asking the right questions and ensuring they are part of the public record.

One important aspect of today's hearing is that some may wonder why we are asking questions that might already be out there or have been asked before. It is essential that these questions are posed and recorded in the public record as it relates to this committee. I want to thank you for answering some questions multiple times, not just in meetings with some members but also here in the public forum.

Let me also add that it is important for our friends in the media, not only those reporting on this hearing but also those covering this topic, to recognize their significant role in this process. It is vital that the media engages in independent investigations and reports not just on what happened today but also on what they observe independently regarding UAPs in the broader community. This is an important public benefit as we strive to uncover the information and facts related to this matter.

Finally, as a long-time teacher and researcher, I firmly believe in following the facts.

[2:13:28 -> 2:15:07]

Chairman:

In doing your homework and making sure that you follow science, we try to gather as much information as possible. I want to thank you all for agreeing to do that today. Transparency is the cornerstone of government. We live in a vast galaxy with many unanswered questions, and I appreciate your presence here today.

Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would like to once again thank Mr. Merchant and Ms. Luna for bringing this to our attention. This topic has interested me since I was in school. It was a very illuminating hearing. Obviously, I think several of us are looking forward to getting some answers in a more confidential setting. I assume some legislation will come out of this.

I apologize, Mr. Chairman; I need to compliment the folks in my office who did a lot of the work on this, Rachel and Noah, who are sitting behind me here. They are very quiet and humble, but without them, this event would not have come off as it did. Thank you.

I think we will want to look into what we can do to make more of this information public. There is certainly a time period after which it should always be made public, and people have been concerned about these issues since I was in high school.

In any event, I would like to thank everybody who was here for sticking through the entire hearing. Without objection, the members will have five legislative days to submit materials and additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to them for their response. If there is no further business, the meeting is adjourned.

UFO whistleblower David Grusch - Full Interview 06/11/2023

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GV4SRQRfDQs>

[00:00 -> 02:46]

David Grusch:

From a respected insider, even if you call them NHI and UAP, how could such NHI travel to Earth in the first place and go undetected by the general public? Grusch says the craft may not be traveling through space as we understand it. It is a well-established fact, at least mathematically and based on empirical observation and analysis, that there most likely are physical additional spatial dimensions. You can imagine in four and five-dimensional space where what we experience as linear time ends up being a physical dimension. In higher-dimensional space, if you were living there, you could translate across what we perceive as a linear flow. So, there is a possibility—this is a theory here; I'm not saying this is 100% the case—but it could be that this is not necessarily extraterrestrial and is actually coming from a higher-dimensional physical space that might be co-located right here.

What can you tell me about these craft and these technologies? Why do you know it's exotic? Based on the very specific properties that I was briefed on, you know, isotopic ratios that would have to be engineered for it to be at those levels, but also just extremely strange heavy atomic metals—high up in the periodic table arrangements that we don't understand. We don't know what the emergent properties are, but there's just a very strange mix of elements.

So, you're absolutely sure that the materials these craft are made of are clearly not of this Earth?

Yeah, they're sophisticatedly engineered, certainly not by humans. While I say the U.S. has gleaned some insight from these materials for military use, so much more could be done if academia and the private sector had access. It's totally nuts that humanity as a whole, especially the citizenry, is not even benefiting from broad research on this to solve propulsion, energy issues, and novel material science that can improve people's quality of life. It's just totally nuts how it's been protected and inhibits progress.

If you're right, if you're telling us the truth, then everyone—the entire American public—has been lied to for decades.

Yeah, there's a sophisticated information campaign targeting the U.S.

[02:48 -> 07:15]

David Grusch:

The populace is being subjected to something that is extremely unethical and immoral. How long has this been going on? A lot of the things I was briefed on were very shocking.

[05:05 -> 05:44]

[Advertisement]

Botox Cosmetics is FDA approved to temporarily improve frown lines, crow's feet, and forehead lines. The effects of Botox Cosmetics may spread hours to two weeks after injection, causing serious symptoms. Alert your doctor right away if you experience difficulty swallowing,

speaking, breathing, eye problems, or muscle weakness, as these may be signs of a life-threatening condition. Do not receive Botox Cosmetic if you have a skin infection. Side effects may include allergic reactions, injection site pain, headache, eyebrow or eyelid drooping, and eyelid swelling. Tell your doctor about your medical history, muscle or nerve conditions, and medications, including botulinum toxins, as these may increase the risk of serious side effects. See for yourself at botoxcosmetic.com.

[05:48 -> 06:16]

[Advertisement]

Meet the team behind the team with a coach, the manager, and the snack down, all using Chase to keep up with their finances. The coach helps save goals here because she's saved for soccer camp there. And check this out: the manager deposited a check—magic! And the snack he's getting paid back with? Orange slices! Because this team all has smart bankers and convenient tools. One bank with the power of both Chase—make more of what's yours.

[06:17 -> 06:31]

[Advertisement]

Michael's biggest deals of the summer are here! Doorwide sale—up now for our lowest prices on thousands of items. Plus, get 30% off your regular price purchase with coupons. Don't miss out on the summer's hottest deals at Michael's.

[06:33 -> 07:15]

[Advertisement]

Oh buddy, you need a hug! You also need Consumer Cellular. Get the exact same coverage as the nation's leading carriers and 100% U.S.-based customer support starting at twenty dollars.

[07:51 -> 07:15]

David Grusch:

So let's start from the very beginning. You say it's a 90-year cover-up, just about? Yeah, 90 years. 1933 was the first recovery in Europe, in Magenta, Italy. They recovered a partially intact vehicle. It's long been known that the regime of dictator Benito Mussolini documented numerous UAP during this time.

[07:19 -> 09:49]

David Grusch:

This internal memo from the Italian secret services includes crude drawings of the UAPs. It's true; it's real. That actually happened. The Italian government moved it to a secure air base in Italy for the rest of the fascist regime until 1944-1945. You know, Pope Pius XII backchanneled that, so the Vatican was involved and told the Americans what the Italians had, and we ended up scooping it.

Interviewer:

So let me be very clear about this. You're saying that the Catholic Church, the Vatican, they know about the existence of non-human intelligence on this planet?

David Grusch:

Certainly. Shortly after the dawn of the atomic age, another major crash recovery took place. You've probably heard of it. What can you tell me about the Roswell craft?

Interviewer:

Fortunately, those details were not approved for me to talk about right now. This much we know: in 1947, an object crashed in the New Mexico desert near the town of Roswell. The Air Force recovered material described as metallic and rubbery, though the government changed its story as to what it was, calling it a flying disc at first, then a weather or spy balloon. It just read ridiculous to me that the U.S. Air Force had changed its story.

David Grusch:

Yeah, and they added additional elements over time and tried to conflate additional programs to explain some of the events. Why are these things crashing? You know, some are landed, some are crashed, and I think that's an interesting discussion that has come up. You know, as advanced as we are as humans, right? You know, planes crash, cars crash. Just because you're some advanced sentience that has advanced technology doesn't mean some small percentage of your—I'll use the Air Force term—like sorties, you know, meet an unfortunate operational conclusion, as we might want to say.

Interviewer:

Most people would tell you the Roswell incident has been thoroughly debunked. In fact, the Air Force published this report in 1994 to put the issue to rest once and for all.

David Grusch:

I've read it. That analysis they did was a total hack job, and even anybody with analytical skills, if you read it, you can deduce that they're conflating multiple situations with crash test dummies.

[09:51 -> 12:46]

David Grusch:

Then there are Mogul balloons, and they're just saying that the townsfolk who personally witnessed it were totally imagining things. They concocted that whole report just to disinform. The reason for the secrecy is, exactly, what? Feudalistic dominance? Who can have both asymmetric technology? It seems like it's just fueling the war machine.

Grusch says that through the 50s and 60s, encounters with non-human intelligence continued, as did the cover-up. One incident in 1967, about which multiple Air Force veterans have gone public, involved UAPs tampering with the nuclear missiles at Malmstrom Air Base in Montana. They saw a craft that appeared to be intelligently controlled, hovering over a nuclear weapons silo and shutting down ten nuclear ICBM missiles. It certainly looks like they want to understand how far we've advanced in our nuclear fizzle kind of technologies, at the very least. I mean, it looks like preparatory probing activity. It might be innocent scientific gathering; it could be ISR probing.

Meanwhile, Grusch says the crash retrieval program continued, and while he won't reveal where the downed craft are stored, he does say that the people working with the technology have been putting themselves at risk. You know, a lot of them were injured looking at some of this stuff. You could imagine the nuclear, radiological, and biological risks involved in examining the unknown, and a lot of them have literally suffered physically because of their service.

But as we know, anyone who's come forward claiming that non-human intelligence is behind these incidents has been dismissed as delusional or deliberately deceitful. If you're right, if you're telling us the truth, then the entire American public has been lied to for decades. Yes, there's a sophisticated disinformation campaign targeting the U.S. populace, which is extremely unethical and immoral.

Coming up, new evidence and perhaps new attitudes in a new age of UAPs. The American people need and deserve to know more. Has the U.S. government changed its tune?

who do you guys think came first, the chicken or the baby back rib? Baby back ribs? Chicken tenders all the way! Baby back ribs!

On second thought, it really depends on which side of the buffet you started on. Want luxury hair repair that doesn't cost 50 dollars?

[12:51 -> 13:29]

Advertiser:

Ten teams of Pro Vitamin Formula repair hair, as well as the leading luxury bonding treatment for softness and resilience, without the price tag. If you know, you know it's Pantene. I got this app from Experian; it's got everything I need to help my finances. It raised my FICO score instantly, and I even found new ways to save. See all you can do with the free Experian app—download it now. If you've had thyroid eye disease for years and the pain in the back of your eyes is forcing bad words from your mouth, it's not too late for another treatment option. To learn more, visit treated.com. That's treated.com.

[16:04 -> 17:58]

David Grusch:

These are the videos that started it all—footage captured by Naval aviators on military-grade cameras that defied all prosaic explanations. I investigated this one shot in 2015 off the east coast by fighter pilots from the USS Theodore Roosevelt. There's an industry of debunkers out there on the web who say, "Oh, they've got this all wrong; it's a jet exhaust at a distance, and the aircraft's turning." Give me an answer. I had some optical engineering experts look at that, and the Raytheon FLIR system, based on the pixel saturation and apparent size, indicates it's certainly something that's not a jet. It might be some kind of natural phenomenon that's quite strange, but it's not as simple as a jet.

He has even stronger opinions about this UAP, now known in history as the Tic Tac, shot in 2004 in the Pacific by aviators off the USS Nimitz. The Tic Tac is truly anomalous—absolutely a technical vehicle, physical, and that's absolutely something that we didn't make, most likely not of this world. The videos were leaked in 2017 and then officially released by the Pentagon in 2020. At the time, it seemed the Pentagon may have finally abandoned its obsession with secrecy and decided to do what other countries have been doing for decades: establish a properly funded, publicly accountable team to investigate reports of UAP. I was part of that team. This is a hunt mission for what might be happening in our backyard that we don't know about. The task force set about investigating these incidents, including more recent events like the odd encounters that took place during...

[18:00 -> 20:30]

Interviewer:

Naval exercises in 2019 off the coast of San Diego produced a video shot on the USS Omaha, which was later leaked to documentarian Jeremy Corbell. This video has received particular attention as it either zooms off so fast that you can't see it or sinks into the ocean. It seems to drop. What do you know about it?

David Grusch:

It was truly anomalous. However, I believe the promised new age of government transparency is a fallacy. For starters, the videos that have been released are just the tip of the iceberg. There are many videos that are totally fair to release through a declassification process, and I find it very concerning from a transparency perspective that all the Department has declassified were those three famous videos. There are more concerning videos that leave me with a lot of questions.

He says there are credible witnesses who could testify to Congress about spacecraft—big spacecraft. A lot of them were very large, very large, like the size of a football field. I remember interviewing these personnel, and I thought either these people are lying to me, they're having a psychotic break, or this is some crazy but true stuff that's happening. I have no good explanation that is prosaic at all for this, because this is not explainable by, you know, swamp gas, St. Elmo's fire, ball lightning, etc. This is like tangible technical craft they're seeing up close and personal in some cases.

At the center of it all is the crash retrieval program, which the government has never publicly acknowledged. Grusch says this program includes at least one private aerospace company that is storing alien craft. Is that true?

David Grusch:

That is how a lot of these relationships are structured. I don't want to name the specific companies and government elements, but overall, the government has been the custodian of a lot of this. They will hand it out to a clear defense contractor to do some analysis, which I find highly unethical. You have basically a sole-source arrangement, and you allow certain private corporate elements to look at this, develop

potential insights, and then sell it back to the government for profit. I think that's totally unethical. The problem you've got is...

[20:33 -> 22:38]

David Grusch:

There have been categorical denials from high-level officials in the U.S. government, even presidents, that what you're saying is true. Unfortunately, some elected officials were not brought in. Only a few weeks ago, on the 19th of April, the head of the Pentagon's UAP investigations program, Dr. Sean Kirkpatrick, told Congress that Arrow—that's the Pentagon's UFO investigation body—has found no credible evidence thus far of extraterrestrial activity, off-world technology, or objects that defy the known laws of physics. While a large number of cases in our holdings remain technically unresolved, this is primarily due to a lack of data associated with those cases. Was that a lie? Well, I know Dr. Sean Kirkpatrick; I've known him for about eight years. I expressed some concerns to Dr. Kirkpatrick about a year ago and told him what I was starting to uncover, and he didn't follow up with me. He has my phone number; he could have called me. I hope he ultimately does the right thing. He should be able to make the same investigative discoveries I did. It's totally crazy if he doesn't.

The implication here is that the head of the very body that Congress has ordered to tell the American public the truth about UAPs is possibly misleading the American public. Do you think the American public is being lied to? Well, they've been lied to over the years, and I'm hoping that the lies stop. It gets even scarier. The UFO whistleblower says the NHIs aren't all friendly. Have human beings been hurt or killed by a non-human intelligence? And guess who they might be working with? We're in a competition with their adversaries to understand this, and it's a multi-decade cold war that has been under our nose for so long.

[26:43 -> 27:20]

Brian Manson:

As News Nation's Brian Manson hosts a live wrap-up right after the special report, we will provide exclusive behind-the-scenes insight from the interview. We have multiple expert panels covering every angle next on News Nation. In the movies, aliens are often portrayed as peaceful, even cuddly. It would be nice if that were true, but Mr. Grusch says it's not. The common interpretation from some commentators is that...

[27:23 -> 29:58]

David Grusch:

There is a non-human species, and it's incredibly benevolently disposed to the human race. I think the logical fallacy there is that because they're advanced, we will never really understand their full intent, because we are not them—whatever "them" is or are. However, I think what appears to be malevolent activity has happened based on not only nuclear site probing activities but also witness testimony. If we look at it through a humanistic lens, it does appear negative, at least to us.

I've been told that there have been attempts to bring down craft that we've acted offensively against. There have been instances where certain techniques have resulted in human beings being hurt or killed by a non-human intelligence. While I can't get into the specifics because that would reveal certain U.S. classified operations, I was briefed by a few individuals on the program that there were malevolent events like that.

Now, I'm scared people have just heard you say non-humans may well have murdered human beings. That seems to be the case at one point, yes. And there's more. The United States is not the only country that's encountered non-human intelligence and their technology. Our geopolitical rivals have their own crash retrieval programs, which they are secretly exploiting for military purposes.

We're in a competition with our adversaries to understand this, and it's a multi-decade cold war that has been under our nose for so long. There is no good way to level the playing field and hold other nation-states accountable if they're engaging in unethical or illicit activity related to this subject. I think the obtuse secrecy is actually putting us in a very dangerous position, where a country might make a breakthrough—let's say it's an adversary of ours—and it could be so destabilizing. You mentioned it's been a cold war behind the scenes with Russia and China; there has indeed been a cold war with our pure adversaries.

[30:00 -> 31:24]

Interviewer:

Why hasn't Russia or China come out and spoken publicly about this? I think they're in a similar situation as us, where they understand some of the socioeconomic destabilization factors in their own society. But if there are non-human intelligences that are so advanced, and at least some of them are malevolent, why haven't they destroyed us already? Perhaps some fragile yet combustible data point has been reached. Grusch has written an internal document about his discoveries that refers to agreements that risk putting our future in jeopardy. It's quite clear that you're talking about agreements between America and non-human intelligences. Have we made agreements with non-human intelligences?

David Grusch:

That's the kind of information I really hope national leadership is able to get to the bottom of. I need to pin you down on this: are there agreements between non-human intelligences and the American government?

Interviewer:

I think that's a question that I would like to know all the details of as well. We do know of at least one agreement among humans that's worth noting: this 1971 agreement between the U.S. and the USSR on measures to reduce the risk of nuclear war. Whether or not you believe Dave Grusch, this document proves the two...

[31:28 -> 32:58]

David Grusch:

Superpowers were aware that UAPs existed. Whatever they were, if you look at Article 3 of that treaty, it talks about unidentified objects near nuclear facilities interfering with communications. That is a treaty that has been used, from what I understand, to notify each other if there's a concerning event. It's a way of saying to the Russians, "Hey, don't shoot at us; it's not us."

Yeah, I mean, that's certainly a concern because this secrecy creates an environment where you could have almost like a false flag. A true non-prosaic UAP situation could be construed as a provocation from a nation-state, and we want to de-escalate that if true. If the stakes are so high, if the fate of the human race is at stake, perhaps it's no surprise to hear me say that the U.S. government will do anything to keep these secrets safe.

Can I put it to you that crimes must have been committed? At the very least, I saw substantive evidence that white-collar crime was committed. Have people been killed to protect the secret? Based on the people I talked to, that was an ongoing concern.

Yeah, unfortunately, I've heard some really un-American things that I don't want to repeat right now. So you have a strong suspicion that people have been murdered to protect these secrets over the years? Yeah, coming up.

[33:02 -> 38:09]

Interviewer:

A reality check: is it possible that you're deluding yourself? It's time to put our whistleblower's credibility to the test. Everybody watching this right now is looking at your face and asking, "Is this guy for real?"

[36:56 -> 38:09]

David Grusch:

Let's talk about what I don't have. I don't have smoking gun documents or photos. I don't have official confirmation of my claims. I'm just a guy talking on camera, and a lot of my answers to your most pointed questions sound like this: "Unfortunately, I cannot comment." So, who am I really? I don't want fame or fortune; I'm just here to provide public leadership on an issue that I uncovered, and I thought it was totally outrageous. News Nation has confirmed through multiple sources that I am who I say I am: an Air Force veteran from Pittsburgh who worked in Military Intelligence and was part of the UAP task force. Maybe I'm just a confident, well-spoken ex-military intelligence officer who happens to have lost his mind. Do you have any kind of mental illness? No. Have you ever had psychosis or delusions? Is there anything in your medical history that might be interpreted as a reason why you might be confabulating or making things up? I'm not a disgruntled employee; I resigned on my own terms.

[38:11 -> 39:30]

David Grusch:

I thought altruistically it was more appropriate to show thought leadership on this now because I hit an impasse within the government in trying to right this wrong. So, I have to be blunt about this: you're not making this up; this is not a lie.

Interviewer:
No, absolutely not.

David Grusch:
Because everybody watching this right now is looking at your face and thinking, "Is this guy for real?"

David Grusch:
I am for real, and I'm sitting here at great personal risk and obvious professional risk by talking to you today. You've told us that we really are not alone. Even though you believe what you say is true, you haven't been fed disinformation. It's a common thing in intelligence for governments to mislead.

David Grusch:
Yes, I was very sensitive to that fact. I wondered if this was some kind of ruse against me or if I was being used in any way. I took about four years, being very methodical, before I filed my whistleblower complaint to be absolutely certain of these basic facts.

Interviewer:
So, take me through the process of how you convinced yourself that this is real.

David Grusch:
well, it was based on the credentialed people that came to me. Some of these subjects provided me sensitive foreign intelligence to read about a sensitive program.

[39:32 -> 40:55]

David Grusch:
I received documents and photographs to evaluate, and they described in very specific detail how all of this worked. They were telling me that the exact, extremely specific details all checked out. The other thing I have trouble with is the fact that, in my experience as a journalist, it's very hard for governments to keep secrets; most things leak. Your government leaks like a sieve. So, why hasn't this leaked? well, I've certainly been the recipient of a lot of U.S. government secrets, and I can tell you they've never seen the light of day, that's for sure. I guess ostensibly this has leaked for decades, but it was a very sophisticated disinformation campaign where they allowed some of the truth to come out through some of their tradecraft. However, they've disenfranchised people and stigmatized it, making it a total wacky thing to talk about. So, anyone who may come forward with that kind of information has looked like a total tinfoil hat guy because it's a perfect amalgamation of disinformation to just make it look crazy. The best reason to believe me may be this document—remember that whistleblower complaint I filed?

[40:58 -> 46:04]

David Grusch:

It would seem it hasn't fallen on deaf ears. The Inspector General of the Intelligence Services of the United States has the information you've got.

Interviewer:

Yes?

David Grusch:

More importantly, the Inspector General made a determination about the credibility of your complaint. They found, after interviewing myself and other subjects, some of whom I'm not even cognizant of, that they found my complaint urgent and credible for the intelligence committees. The word "credible" is important, you appreciate. So, an official investigatory body of the United States government has determined that your allegations are credible, correct?

Interviewer:

Coming up, if it is true, then what? What are we going to do if the biggest secret on the planet is now out in the open? How will the non-human intelligence react?

David Grusch:

This is one of the gravest constitutional crises for your country ever. Absolutely. Give me some hope here. There are good people—there are very good people—and I want that message to be crystal clear. Let's not demonize holistically the U.S. government. There's a whole army of people that want change. I am one of tens, if not hundreds, of individuals within the government on these programs that would like a change.

[46:05 -> 47:42]

Interviewer:

What kind of change does David Grusch want? As he said here tonight, he wants the non-human intelligence (NHI) technology to be shared so the rest of the world can benefit from it. I use nuclear weapons or nuclear physics as an example. We have an acknowledged program for nuclear weapons; you don't get to know the designs, but nuclear physics holistically is unclassified. Academia studies it, so why would you suppress basic astrophysics, astrobiology, and other hard and soft sciences broadly? It's totally nonsensical.

David Grusch has left the government; he wasn't part of Arrow during the most recent Congressional hearings when even more unidentified aerial phenomena (UAP) were revealed, including one captured by a drone in the Middle East in 2022. His whistleblower case will take months to conclude. In the meantime, he says he's starting a scientific foundation and is willing to speak to anyone in Washington who has the clearance and the desire to hear the classified information he could not share here.

David Grusch:

I make myself available to Secretary Austin and DNI Haynes, who are recipients of my complaints. I'm happy to further brief elected officials on the specific ecosystem of secrecy, down to the fine details, whoever they are.

Interviewer:

How will the non-human intelligence react to the revelation that human beings now know they're here?

David Grusch:

Yeah, I mean, obviously, the non-human intelligences have been around...

[47:43 -> 49:06]

David Grusch:

For a while, at least multiple decades in modern history, they've allowed us to annihilate ourselves—genocide, war, famine, etc. So, at the very least, I think they're kind of neutral on what humans decide to do with their free will. As for how we, the human race, will react to this story, I evince that quintessentially human characteristic: optimism. I don't have this utopian ideology that this is going to solve real problems or stop war entirely, but all I want is a moment of pause to see if the subject unites us, as we've obviously become more divided over the last couple of decades. Because, if anything else, what you're revealing may mean we all start thinking of ourselves not as American, Australian, Russian, or Chinese, but as part of the human family. I think that's totally the right term.

Brian Anton:

Wow, okay, so now we are going to attempt to process this all together. Hey everybody, I'm Brian Anton. I'm live at the News Nation headquarters in Chicago. Whether you are a UFO believer, a skeptic, or someone somewhere in the middle—which I think is most of us—we know that the conversation with the UFO whistleblower was a lot.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kRO5jOa06Qw>
UFO whistleblower David Grusch Tells Me Everything
[00:01 -> 00:54]

Narrator:

Three men who previously served in the military are set to speak publicly about what they saw in the sky and heard behind closed doors.

All right. One more-guy in the white tan suit.

There is David Grusch, a former intelligence official. He has knowledge of a covert government program to recover crashed alien spacecraft.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

That is David Grusch, a former Afghanistan combat veteran and 14-year high-ranking intelligence officer.

In 2019, he was tasked by the Pentagon to investigate UFOs as part of the Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena Task Force.

I had no interest in UFOs or whatever, but I thought it would be kind of an interesting thing to see what was going on.

[00:55 -> 01:50]

Narrator:

During his investigation, Grusch started to uncover a program that was being systematically hidden from him, the American public, and our elected representatives.

We're done with the cover-up, and we're going to get to the bottom of it, dadgum it.

A program whose mandate was to find and retrieve crashed UFOs and attempt to rebuild them into functional vehicles that humans can fly.

And I'm sitting there, and I'm like, okay, well, this is a thing.

Thanks to new UFO whistleblower protections, Grusch provided comprehensive documentation about these programs to the inspector general in the summer of 2022.

He brought people involved in the secret UFO programs directly to meet the inspector general's team and even gave the staff the names of the aerospace companies involved in these programs and the locations where the UFOs were ostensibly being kept.

I filed my complaint. I told them who to interview. And, you know, they ultimately were like, "Holy shit, this is credible."

[01:51 -> 02:14]

Narrator:

In June of 2023, he outed himself to the public, giving News Nation and The Debrief exclusive interviews.

Do we have bodies? Do we have species?

So naturally, when you recover something that's either landed or crashed, sometimes you encounter dead pilots.

Then in late July, he testified before Congress in Washington, D.C. The hearing was a wild moment in history.

[02:15 -> 02:30]

David Grusch:

Yup, there I am with Ammar Kandil from the second-best YouTube channel online, Yes Theory.
If you want instant inspiration and exposure to untold human stories across the world, throw them a subscription and stay tuned for their UFO documentary, including me, coming soon.

[02:31 -> 03:06]

David Grusch:

I've known Dave for about two years when we were introduced by a mutual friend who had served in the Air Force with him.
Through many phone calls, he's put up with my wild speculations on the truth behind UFOs.
Sometimes I'm like hanging up the phone, you call me, and I'm like, I don't know about this guy. I think he's really losing his grip.

[03:07 -> 03:54]

Narrator:

During the lead-up to the hearing and in its aftermath, we were granted exclusive access.
We actually held the first and only public hearing with Dave and 20 young Yes Theory fans in Washington, D.C., after the congressional hearings.
We traveled with him, hiked the mountains of Colorado, got covered in dust on ATVs, and hung out with some llamas.
What's the name of the llama?
David Grusch:
Playboy. Playboy.

[03:55 -> 04:04]

Narrator:

And of course, we had a long-form conversation.
We discussed the history of covert UFO research programs, their connection with Robert Oppenheimer and the Manhattan Project, why presidents and elected officials may have been shielded from the UFO secrets in the past, and, of course, his best theories as to how these UFOs fly, who their occupants are, and why they're here.

[04:05 -> 04:12]

Narrator:

While you'll see a candid side of Dave that you've never seen before, he's still somewhat limited in what he can and can't say.
David Grusch:
I don't want to get into specifics.

[03:56 -> 08:11]

Interviewer:

I don't want to get into that. I can't really go beyond that. If anything slips that wasn't pre-approved by the Defense Department, he could literally go to jail. But there's a lot of pretty insane new stuff he does say. The Manhattan Project, they were kind of the first blue book. Do you think Bob Lazar is full of it? Have we made any agreements with any of the aliens? Do you have a sense of the species? And if you combine our open-source research with his revelations, you can actually piece together a sort of coherent picture of what's going

on with UFOs and human attempts to reverse engineer them. Buckle up, I guess. So, without further ado, this is the atom bomb of American Alchemy episodes. It's been marinating for months, and it was executed with the Manhattan Project-style secrecy. All of the crew members weren't allowed to disclose what they were working on. But I'm so excited that it's finally dropping, and you are here to see it. So get your radiation goggles on. Hit subscribe and brace yourselves for a brain dump of everything you've ever wanted to know about UFOs from today's American Alchemist: David Grusch.

[05:40 -> 06:11]

David Grusch:
Hey, man.

[05:41 -> 05:46]

Interviewer:
Crazy day.

[05:45 -> 05:50]

David Grusch:
Yeah. So, what happened yesterday? I didn't read the news.

[05:50 -> 06:11]

David Grusch:
My name is David Charles Grusch. I was an intelligence officer for 14 years. I was my agency's co-lead in unidentified anomalous phenomena and trans-medium object analysis, as well as reporting to the UAP Task Force, UAPTF, and eventually, once it was established, the All Domain Anomaly Resolution Office, ARO.

[06:11 -> 06:35]

Interviewer:
why were you placed on the UAPTF? And UAPTF, for the people that don't know, is the Unidentified Anomalous Phenomenon Task Force.

[06:14 -> 06:35]

David Grusch:
The UAP task force director funneled the request through the ops center like, "Hey, is there any intel officer from your agency who would be willing to be a representative on the task force to kind of fill that void with expertise from NRO and the Air Force?" My boss got the email, forwarded it to me, and he said, "Do you want to do this?" I thought, well, I'm a reservist. I can put it on my performance report that I worked on a task force. I thought it'd be kind of an interesting thing to see what was going on.

[06:35 -> 07:01]

Interviewer:
when did you start to realize that you weren't just looking at anomalous phenomena and trying to classify it in the air, but you were being systematically lied to about an internal reverse engineering program within the government?

[07:01 -> 07:39]

David Grusch:

Yeah. I mean, certainly going into it, I thought it was going to be, you know, air trash, some prosaic natural phenomenon. I remember interviewing some military members who saw some really profound stuff, like large triangular crafts, you know, football field-sized, that hovered over them. I was like, "Whoa." And these people were very serious, very upset to actually divulge that, you know, a personal thing. It was nothing classified; it was a personal observation they had on a drive to work. And then, one thing led to another. I had certain colleagues of mine that I'd known for years approach me, close the door in my office, and say, "Look, you need to know about some other stuff you guys are not getting access to."

[07:39 -> 08:11]

Interviewer:

why do you think they talked? why do you think they spoke to you?

[08:11 -> 08:11]

David Grusch:

Yeah, I think a lot of these guys were, you know, they've kept the secret for so many years. They knew me. They knew what I was looking into. You know, we reported to the Deputy Secretary of Defense and Congress at the time with the UAP task force.

[08:12 -> 11:39]

David Grusch:

I think they wanted some change. At least that's what they expressed to me. Why do you think they want change? You know, they felt that they were kind of limited in bringing people in. The support they were getting was insufficient, and their treatment was harsh sometimes. I guess they weren't really feeling the love anymore.

What's the first moment where you saw irrefutable evidence that what you're dealing with is truth, is reality? I mean, there were certain military cases we were analyzing that I just really couldn't explain in a prosaic fashion.

What can you tell me about these crafts? Why do you know it's exotic? Based on the very specific properties that I was briefed on, you know, isotopic ratios that would have to be engineered for it to be at those levels. And then, of course, I read some intel reports that were provided to me in that regard. I took that and went to the agencies that wrote those reports and asked for access. When they deny you access, then you know it's a thing. That happened to me time after time over a couple of years.

So, there wasn't a singular moment where I just opened the folder and thought, "What the heck is that?" It was kind of a slow burn culmination as I was processing it, allowing my worldview to open. I don't know if there was a singular moment. I think it was some of the really trusted high-level people we talked to. When they stared us straight in the face very seriously and confirmed a lot of this information, the quality of people we talked to—if they ever go public, it'll blow your mind who we talked to. I was like, "Wow, I

can't believe I'm talking to X," who is a really important person. They're confirming these certain details and saying, "We need to protect this at all costs." They gave me the whole speech about it, and I was sitting there having an out-of-body experience, thinking, "Okay, well, this is a thing."

I don't report to anybody, and there is no plan. I'm not a part of some slow-drip disclosure or anything. If there is a plan, I'm totally unwitting. Holy shit, they've controlled me in a very passive manner that is like masterclass, but I'm not a part of some weird stuff, you know that.

Did you ever, at any point, try to suss out whether you were being lied to? Because all of these people are coming from the same programs, and presumably, there's some level of coordination between them. So how do you kind of get through that and just make sure that they're not meeting in some back room saying, "You say this to Dave, I'll say this to Dave"?

Yeah, no, for sure. I thought maybe it was a joke or something, maybe it was a psy-op on me or something. I don't even know. But, you know, the nearly 40 people we talked to—many of the guys I've known my entire career—they wouldn't lie to me. I have a friendship with them, and for them to disclose that kind of stuff to me and it end up being false would have totally torpedoed the friendship.

I also went out of my way to find people who don't know each other either. I had other high-ranking colleagues of mine talk to other people that I didn't even personally talk to. That group, of course, we took all that, and I made sure all the people who conducted those interviews got interviewed by the inspector general because we were crossing our T's here.

[11:41 -> 15:14]

David Grusch:

Because this situation is crazy. I mean, you can never be perfect, but I was extremely careful to ensure that I wasn't being fed any misinformation. If they were coordinating a disinformation campaign, then I shouldn't even be an intelligence officer because I should have sniffed that out.

In the last couple of years, have you had incidents that have caused you to fear for your life for addressing these issues?

Yes, personally. There's a story about Chris Mellon where he was supposed to meet with someone involved in the program. He had the meeting all set up, and two weeks before the meeting, the guy randomly had a heart attack. We were about two weeks away from meeting when he died from that heart attack.

What was the last special access program that leaked? They don't generally leak. People often ask, "Oh, wouldn't it be broadly leaked?" I'm like, as someone who has been super cleared to a lot of that conventional stuff over the years, things never leak.

Yeah, it doesn't come out. There are plenty of serious matters that have never seen the light of day. Of course, you're going to tell someone that their entire life, their family, and their kids are in danger. It doesn't seem far-fetched that someone would keep a secret if it threatens their life.

Look, you're not getting promoted. You're going to lose your job. You know the psychology of the typical career government worker, right? Stable paycheck, pension, maintained clearance. So if any of that is threatened, you know they're going to capitulate in most cases.

The threatening nature of some of their indoctrination is such that they think, "This is treason. You're going to Leavenworth if you ever tell anybody not in the program." And oh, by the way, what's the penalty for treason? Oh, right. Execution.

I thought, well, forget it. I'll be the mouthpiece for you. I'll be the leader, I guess, and I will shepherd you privately to the appropriate people who could be recipients of your disclosure. You don't have to go public, but I'll handle it.

I mean, it's not just me that has come forward. Schumer, Rubio, all those guys have woken up to the fact that a bunch of high-level officers came to us, and either they're crazy or this situation is real. Most of these people have held very high clearances and high positions within our government at some point, or maybe even currently.

Then Schumer was compelled to write that big 64-page amendment that discusses non-human technology recoveries. You have the majority leader, who is tight with the president, putting out a law that will hopefully be signed this fall, which really puts the executive in a bind.

I don't think that was done in a vacuum. I believe the one thing that can unite the left and the right is the bloat in the military-industrial complex. Nobody likes that. I don't think members of Congress enjoy getting the door shut on them either. They want that information because they represent their constituents.

That was the Matt Gaetz story several months ago. My office received a protected disclosure from Eglin Air Force Base indicating that there was a UAP incident that required my attention. We were not afforded access to all of the flight crew, who were basically denied access to a crew that had seen a diamond-shaped formation of orbs.

He should be fully clued into whether it is terrestrial in origin because he's on the Armed Services Committee. If you could just name any titles, programs, or departments...

[15:19 -> 18:40]

David Grusch:

I'd be happy to give you that in an enclosed environment. I can tell

you specifically. Thank you. Maybe if we could get into a confidential area, a SCIF, we can talk about that. But unfortunately, we were denied access to the SCIF. A lot of the narrative for the whole thing was that you were denied a SCIF. What does SCIF stand for, just for people? It stands for a Specialized Compartmented Information Facility, which basically means that you would get into a secure place where you can share information. Yeah, that's a facility that's accredited to discuss top secret, sensitive compartmented information. And yeah, the members were pretty incensed that, I believe it was like they couldn't reserve a SCIF, and then they couldn't give me a one-time read on back into the right accesses since I left the government. Do you have any sense of why that was denied? I don't know. No, I don't really have insight. It was something they mentioned to me; you know, it was security or something that denied it.

If you believe we have crashed craft, as stated earlier, do we have the bodies of the pilots who piloted this craft? As I've stated publicly already in my News Nation interview, biologics came with some of these recoveries. Yeah. Were they, I guess, human or non-human biologics? Non-human. And that was the assessment of people with direct knowledge of the program I talked to who are currently still on the program. We had one sort of bombshell sound bite from the hearing as Congresswoman Nancy Mace asked you about biologics. Ross Coulthart in the News Nation interview asked you about pilots coming out of these crafts. Do you want to just speak to that a little bit?

Yeah. I mean, it is a mind-blowing side of it, right? It's a little easy to imagine, you know, an artifact or whatever. But when you start talking about the biological side of it, it really throws you for a loop psychologically. It did for me. And, you know, I talked to the people that were on that aspect of the program, if you will. I mean, it comes with the territory. I mean, buckle up, I guess. I call them pilots because that's like our vernacular. What they... I don't know what their actual job was. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Non-human intelligence. Yeah. But they had bodies.

Yeah. I mean, were they alive? Were they dead? I don't want to get into specifics. Yeah, I know a lot of that stuff. Out of curiosity, why are you allowed to say that NHI pilots came out of that craft but you can't... Well, that's all I put in the pre-publication stuff I got approved. I mean, got it. I could go back and ask for more, but like I said earlier, man, it's not your place, not your job.

Yeah. And it's helpful context for the audience to realize that you literally have these contours with... you have to operate within any specific knowledge you garnered when you were on the other side of the door. If I want to talk about that publicly, everybody who has had a job like I have has to submit to a thing called DOPSR at the Pentagon, D.O.D. Pre-Publication and Security Review. You know, even if it's about this stuff, like I know it sounds insane, but you literally have to say, like, this is why I want to talk about it. Why do you think they approved it? Catch 22. Because they'd have to self-identify and highlight their concerns to redact. So the office would propose a redaction, say it's a three-letter agency or whatever, right?

[18:42 -> 22:30]

David Grusch:

They'd have to be like this office objected to you saying crash retrievals. Here we're citing the security classification guide. No. And then you can litigate that, right, to get it unredacted if you think that's an inappropriate application of security. If it got redacted like that and it cited what organization and what security reason it is, I would just publish that. Then the public can understand, you know, make its own interpretation of why the U.S. government is withholding information about that kind of thing and wanted to sequester my speech. So it's a catch-22 honestly for them; damned if they do, damned if they don't. I just wanted to put enough out there, touch on all the most sensitive parts like the biologic side and like things that really need to come out. Yeah, but I don't want to overly disclose because it's not my job, but enough to, you know, put the flag out there. Yeah, we need to elevate this; this is serious, some of the uncomfortable stuff, like the biologic stuff like I mentioned during the hearing. Yeah. You got to realize some baggage is coming with it besides, you know, the Indiana Jones, you know, warehouse thing that everybody thinks.

why do the politicians, like, why do people who are higher up feel like they need to hide evidence or like, and just like the root cause? Like, why is this like a topic that's... Yeah, I mean, I can only know what the mindset was, you know, multiple decades ago. And like anything in government, they're resistant to change. So this is the way we set it up. Remember, our trust in government was high back in the forties, postwar, and then also society was less secular. So there's, you know, they're worried about the religious ontological shocks as well. And they never really developed a, we'll call it, disclosure plan for what it's worth. And they just were like, this is the way it's been and we're going to keep it that way. And we don't want Russia and China to be exposed to any of this info. And, you know, we don't want to give them an edge. And fortunately, it's that kind of low-energy thinking.

If you could ask one question to someone who is not alive anymore that you feel could answer a lot for you, who would you pick and what would the question be? I would probably ask Sarbacher, Oppenheimer and be like, what was your thought process in the forties and fifties, you know, scrolling this away? I mean, besides overlaying the Manhattan Project secrecy, because Oppenheimer was the one who created the classification that included the UFO stuff. Oh, all those guys. The guys that were involved in Manhattan were overlaying the same ecosystem of secrecy in some of the same ways to protect stuff that they're protecting our nuclear secrets. If you read the definition of special nuclear material in the Public Atomic Energy Act of 1954, it basically states any material that releases any kind of atomic energy. That would be retrieved crash material. So it's kind of a sneaky way. You know, it is if you actually read the Atomic Energy Act, if something is not a nuke, but it has radiological energy coming off it, you know, alpha, beta decay, whatever, same secrecy, same secrecy.

Until now, we haven't really had an exact understanding of the mechanisms of UFO secrecy. We do get a few hints throughout history, though. In 1947, in the aftermath of frequent UFO sightings across the United States, Nathan Twining, the head of all aircraft development for the Air Force, wrote a famous letter. He writes that the UFO phenomena is something real and not visionary or fictitious. Everyone today focuses on this part of the now-famous Twining memo that top brass at the Air Force is conceding the reality of UFOs. But the far more interesting...

[22:32 -> 26:16]

David Grusch:

Part of the letter is the postscript, where he writes about the possibility of American programs trying to build crafts with these capabilities. He writes that any developments in this country along the lines indicated would be extremely expensive, time-consuming, and at the considerable expense of current projects. Therefore, if directed, it should be set up independently of existing projects.

If you were the military-industrial complex and had to keep a top-secret UFO reverse engineering program fully shielded from elected civilian representatives moving in and out of government, which past programs might be your inspiration? The Manhattan Project. They were kind of the first Blue Book. You know, they were getting UFO reports back in the day. There were some people I'm colleagues with whose grandparents were actually the UFO report people on the Manhattan Project, and I remember being told that, and I was like, "Really? Holy crap, that's crazy." You know, there's like a whole other side of the Manhattan Project.

This is a wild revelation. Blue Book was the Air Force's official program tasked with investigating UFOs in the fifties and sixties. But it was basically a propaganda mouthpiece for the Air Force, explaining away and downplaying the phenomena for the public. Here, Dave is saying that there might have been a real deeper program than Blue Book studying UFOs at the time, and it was probably very tied in with the Manhattan Project.

Legendary French UFO researcher Jacques Vallee told me the exact same thing. Project Blue Book was the best they could do at the time because they felt they had a real project going on that was secret. The Manhattan Project would have custody of it, and then it would go into the Atomic Energy Commission, and then it would go into the Department of Energy, which has its own line of clearances.

But where were these top-secret UFO programs taking place? Well, the first hint we get might actually come from the quintessential UFO story, the Roswell crash in 1947. As the story goes, in 1947, mysterious debris from a crash was retrieved by a rancher named Mac Brazel. After collecting the wreckage, the Roswell Army Airfield issued a pretty insane press release stating that a flying disc had been retrieved from a local ranch. But within 24 hours, the military announced that the saucer had actually just been a weather balloon.

Cut to 1978. Lieutenant Colonel Jesse Marcel said that this was all just a cover story to divert public attention away from the truth that the Roswell debris was extraterrestrial tech, which contained bizarre hieroglyphics and malleable memory metal. According to him, the materials were eventually taken to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio. This actually makes sense. Wright-Patt was the place that the military would take enemy equipment in order to reverse engineer it. In fact, just a few years earlier, the base was used to successfully reverse engineer a German pulse jet engine.

When prominent elected government representatives would ask what was going on at Wright-Patterson, they would get shut down. It didn't matter who they were—senators, presidential candidates, even presidents. If you didn't have a need to know, you were on the outside.

I called Curtis LeMay and I said, "General, I know we have a room at Wright-Patterson where you put all this secret stuff. Could I go in there?" I've never heard him get mad, but he got madder than hell at me, cussed me out, and said, "Don't ever ask me that question." It's like, "Well, what's going on? Why would General LeMay act like that to a sitting senator?"

[26:17 -> 29:58]

David Grusch:

Unless you're George H.W. Bush, Bush 41, who was the Director of the CIA as well as the President of the United States, you probably don't even know. Unless you've done the blood oath or were the CIA director previously, unless you had to stroke a pen to sign an executive order or something, why would you have a need to know? Unless you literally, as the Commander in Chief, need to know it to make a decision.

What else was housed at Wright-Patterson? Well, it would become a nuclear engineering test facility and an antigravity research center. It also was the site for Project Blue Book, the anti-UFO psyop that the Air Force ran in the fifties and sixties. So when you're running a secret UFO program, you have people working on the UFOs, and then you have people working on throwing the public off the trail and basically ensuring that they have no idea what you're doing. The official Air Force reply has long been that there is no cover-up.

You know, I've seen this at other conventional programs; you compartmentalize it so much that some people don't really know what they're working on. Only the people with top-level access can look down on all facets of the pyramid, as we say. And that hinders progress. Certainly, with this subject, when you're trying to crack an unknown unknown, that kind of obtuse security doesn't help either.

When you say "unknown unknown," is it like the USB drive to a caveman analogy, where the caveman doesn't know information theory and doesn't have a computer to plug the USB drive into? We just don't even know where to start in terms of reverse engineering.

Well, yeah, I think it's like other people have given the analogy of

giving Galileo a TI-83 Plus graphing calculator. They open it up and see circuitry and think, "What is even this?" They don't have a concept of a transistor. But even that, or like a monkey with an iPhone, you kind of know how to press the buttons and realize there's this graphical interface or whatever. That seems easier than a caveman with a USB drive.

So yeah, where are we in that? I mean, some of it is hard to gauge how far in advance it is because you're just assuming a certain linear progression. I think some of this is that they made an asymptotic leap, putting them over the edge to a different kind of plane—that's pretty fascinating, like a different timeline almost.

If I were a betting man, I would say some of this non-human intelligence is similarly advanced as us, but they've just made what is it, asymmetric evolution or whatever. They went a different path where we made nuclear weapons and stuff, and they ended up making this civil propulsion equivalent.

Yeah, discovery where they're able to do this now, but they're actually not that much more advanced than you and I. I always found it interesting to think about the monolith in "2001: A Space Odyssey," which is this sort of thing placed on Earth that inspires tech innovation. It's almost like John Mack would talk about a lot of these alien sightings being slightly more advanced but barely comprehensible tech for the time, almost inspiring tech innovation.

I often think of it as laying breadcrumbs in a direction. The communication could be, "You think you're really smart because you blew up a weapon down the road here? Now, look at this." Right, right, right.

It's just like, you know, if you look at our own human development, once we cracked the atom, I mean, holy crap, nuclear power, weapons...

[30:00 -> 33:33]

David Grusch:

We went from orders of magnitude of energy extraction up to ten to the sixth tons of TNT equivalent. That's kind of what we're talking about. It's like we're one discovery away from maybe manipulating space-time or whatever. Based on the information that you've been privy to, is there any indication that these UAPs are interested in our nuclear technology and capabilities?

Yes, by external observation, sure. That could be a fair assessment. The nuclear-UFO connection is deeper and more bizarre than you can ever imagine.

You remember that Vice story that ran in 2022 about a town in Japan that's obsessed with UFOs? Well, it's a place called Lino, and it's right next to Fukushima, where a 2011 earthquake triggered a famous nuclear power meltdown.

Or take this incident in 1994: 62 elementary school kids at the Ariel

International School in Zimbabwe said that they saw a silver craft descend from the sky and land on a field near their school. Well, guess where the Ariel School was? It was near a uranium mining site.

That is right, as far as I understand. But maybe the best collection of evidence around the UFO-nuclear connection comes from a very creatively named book called "UFOs and Nukes" by Robert Hastings. He started to investigate and speak to all of these radar operators, and a lot of them claim some pretty crazy things about seeing UFOs around nuclear bases.

Over the past 37 years, I have personally located and interviewed more than 120 of these former or retired military personnel. You have Robert Salas at Malmstrom saying that the whole base was actually rendered inoperable. At that time, he was screaming into the phone, saying they were looking at an object, a red glowing object.

Yeah, the sights were going down one by one. Very rarely does a missile malfunction, and I don't think it's much more rare for two to malfunction at the same time. But never ten.

You have Bob Jacobs at Vandenberg in '64. He's a photo instrumentation specialist. They were launching dummy nuclear warheads off of Atlas V missiles and saw a UFO kind of wrap around it and take it down. I said, "It looks like we've got a UFO."

You have hundreds of accounts from these missile man radar operators at nuclear sites who have no incentive to lie. In many cases, the incentives—or in all cases, the incentives—split in the other direction, saying that they're seeing stuff.

Well, I know the missileers; they're on what they call the Personal Reliability Program. They have to report if they take an ibuprofen, for God's sake, because they're key turners for nuclear weapons.

These missileers go through the most stringent mental health exams to get their jobs. They're literally the people we task with hitting the button that sends a nuke. By definition, they're the picture of mental health.

And they are all steeped in a culture that frowns upon attention-seeking. Time and time again, these missile men would see UFOs near nuclear facilities, and without fail, the Air Force Office of Special Investigations would show up, men in black style, confiscate the footage, threaten the witnesses, and swear them to secrecy.

And he said, "Lieutenant Jacobs, you are never to speak of this again. It never happened." From Hastings' work, we now know that UFO sightings were happening all across American nuclear production, missile storage, and deployment sites.

[33:35 -> 37:09]
David Grusch:

Plutonium enrichment sites like Hanford, Washington, and the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. To nuclear stockpiles at Fort Hood, Texas, and Killeen Base Camps. From Los Alamos to Sandia, to Malmstrom, to F.E. Warren. The list goes on.

What is the connection with nuclear? Is it the kind of benevolent protector theory where they don't want us to destroy ourselves? Or is it something more peculiar, like they're mining us for something and want to protect their resources? Or is it related to the power unlock concept, where we could rip space-time and maybe be able to travel like they can? Nuclear power might be the axis along which we're making progress toward that.

It could be as simple as it's an attractant, like a fly or mosquito to a blue light. It's so hard to put yourself in a different sentient's shoes to understand intent. It could be probing, reconnaissance, or mere curiosity. Yes.

You know, they might be only two or three orders of magnitude away from energy extraction that could allow them to manipulate space-time, like in an Alcubierre warp drive scenario. Maybe they're interested in that too, to understand our development as a civilization. Without having a penetration into their OODA loop or whatever, we'll never really know.

Yeah, it could be all of the above. And it's really impossible to gauge intent accurately. The controller told us that these objects had been observed for over two weeks, coming down from over 80,000 feet, rapidly descending to 20,000 feet, hanging out for hours, and then going straight back up. For those who don't realize, above 80,000 feet is space.

It's just this cat-and-mouse sort of recursive unsolvability where it's very hard to classify. It's almost like they're playing with you a little bit. Even Commander David Fravor, in his account, mentioned that the object felt like it was breathing and looking at him, and he even let it slip in his testimony that it was definitely aware of our existence. I'm like, how do you know that? You're not in the UFO's shoes. But I understand what he was saying; you can sense when someone is looking at you.

Yeah, I know. I've talked to some folks who had their own close encounters. They said they got that vibe too. Who knows if that's psychosomatic or what, but they did get a similar vibe. When you stare into the abyss long enough, the abyss stares back.

Yeah, exactly. And then, of course, I had a very smart person say, "Well, did Darwin care to fully conceal himself when he studied finches?" It's like they observe; they don't really care to interact, but they're just here to observe. But is that your bias, that it's sort of an anthropological or zoological model where they're studying us, and we're in this kind of petri dish?

Yeah, I think, you know, I'll give credit to Luis for the whole

gorilla-in-the-cage analogy. You throw it a banana, throw it the key, and see if it can unlock the cage. Maybe that's what some of these crashes were about; it wasn't really a mission failure, if you will. It was maybe some seeding. This is a total theoretical framework here, so you never really know.

But you see what you can do with this, or the key is nuclear power or something. It's like the gorilla has the key. Another analogy that Eric Weinstein loves to use is he talks about North Sentinel Island.

[37:10 -> 40:54]

David Grusch:

There is an island of Aboriginals who have not made any contact with civilization. It's off the coast of India, and the Indian government basically lets them do their thing and respects their autonomy. Take this analogy: if the North Sentinelese started developing nuclear weapons, perhaps the Indian government would start to pay a little more attention.

To the extent that there is interference, one anomaly that's important to discuss is the significant amount of electromagnetic radiation that seems to emanate from these crafts. I remember talking to Gary Nolan, who mentioned that he was given a file by the CIA and tasked with investigating this. It involved two things: individuals who had anomalous UFO experiences and those who had experienced what became known as Havana Syndrome.

Diplomats and spies began to hear strange sounds and fell ill with a mysterious illness that was difficult to explain. In both cases, there were severe electromagnetic radiation effects, often accompanied by changes in the caudate nucleus and putamen, which are parts of the basal ganglia in the brain. This scarring, along with alterations in neuronal density in that area, could lead someone to make contact.

Do we have any theories regarding the electromagnetic radiation component? If we were to examine it from a relativistic perspective, it sounds like visible light being blue-shifted into the ultraviolet spectrum, resulting in what could be described as a sunburn. If we consider an Alcubierre-type scenario, where light is lensed around the craft, we would expect to see blue and red shifts. Objects approaching would appear redshifted spectrally, and individuals might experience burns, which would indicate exposure to ultraviolet or ionizing radiation.

This could be light being blue-shifted into the ultraviolet as it lenses across the bubble created by the craft. We are observing artifacts that suggest they are manipulating space-time. This might explain the phenomenon of skipping across time; it appears as though they are literally folding space-time. Essentially, you could get from point A to point Z by riding a wave, akin to being on top of a tsunami wave as it travels through space-time.

Additionally, consider the concept of an Einstein-Rosen Bridge: if you visualize two points on a piece of paper and fold it, the way they are

jumping around and skipping resembles riding a wave. It gives the impression of rapid movement with punctuated motions. Think of an accordion; when you flatten it out, representing flat space-time, you would move smoothly across.

However, we are still grappling with Einstein's theories, which were groundbreaking, yet no one has truly unified all the weak and strong forces. There are ongoing efforts in string theory, M-brane theory, quantum gravity, and other physics theories, but a comprehensive unification remains elusive. The discovery of the Higgs boson may provide significant answers, but we will have to wait and see.

Speaking of string theory, it seems that it has yet to produce tangible results. We have our best and brightest minds, often incredibly intelligent individuals, delving into this field, but...

[40:57 -> 44:42]

David Grusch:

You know, maybe you can detect black holes with strings, but generally it's just not that useful. Well, string theory, I mean, mathematically it works out, right? But like most of the stuff you can't empirically observe because the strings are so small. Subatomically, there's just no way of—it's 11 dimensions. No way of verifying that. So it's a nice, I'll call it like an overlay, or that maybe this is reality, maybe it's not; it mathematically works out. I think it's force-fitting general relativity and quantum field theory.

But this brings up an interesting question, which is can we go down the tree trunk of physics and then find another branch? Clearly, quantum physics, with nuclear and hydrogen bombs as its byproducts, was becoming dangerous. It is an atomic bomb. It is a harnessing of the basic power of the universe. After the invention of these apocalyptic weapons, was true fundamental physics then concealed in deep black aerospace? While public-facing physics was sent into a cul-de-sac so it could do less damage? Were there actually updates in physics, maybe mid-century, that were not disclosed to the public?

Okay, I realize this sounds kind of insane, but hear me out. Imagine that this billiard ball is a proton. The golden age of relativity was a wild, forgotten time in the history of American physics. This was a period in the fifties where the study of antigravity—yeah, you heard me right, antigravity—experienced a dramatic resurgence of interest, not just among quacks, but among real physicists. Since then, there has been a steady but constant improvement.

Roger Babson, a patron of science, was obsessed with finding the solution to antigravity. His Gravity Research Foundation held a popular essay contest which garnered contributions from many of the top minds at the time. Meanwhile, another industrialist, Agnew Bahnson, started the Institute of Field Physics in North Carolina, also dedicated to the study of antigravity. His Chapel Hill conference in 1957 included top physicists like Bryce Dewitt, Richard Feynman, Peter Bergman, Freeman Dyson, and John Wheeler, all there to discuss the role of gravity in physics.

As physicist Louis Witten would go on to say about antigravity in the fifties, it was in the wind, meaning it was everywhere. He said, "What are you doing about antigravity?" And I said, "Well, I'm not against gravity." Witten actually worked in Martin Corporation's Antigravity Research unit. That's right, they had an antigravity research outfit. It was called the Research Institute for Advanced Studies, or RIAS for short. And Martin Corporation, of course, would later become Lockheed Martin.

Louis Witten's direct boss at RIAS was a guy named George Trimble. In a 1956 article found in Jane's Defense Weekly, George Trimble said, "We're already working on nuclear fuels and equipment to cancel out gravity," and added that the conquest of gravity could be done in about the amount of time it took to build the first atom bomb. By the time the sixties rolled around, most people had kind of forgotten about antigravity. It quieted down because nobody ever got anywhere, or it quieted down because it did get somewhere and it went black.

This is kind of weird where, as far as I know, in my kind of topological physics history knowledge, there were all these anti-grav groups up until the early sixties, and then they totally vaporized. You know, there's physics knowledge held by aerospace companies that is not known.

[44:43 -> 48:37]

David Grusch:

There certainly is materials knowledge, materials which involve topological physics or whatever. It's hard to say whether anything real was discovered in the realm of anti-gravity or if it went black. When aviation journalist Nick Cook tried to meet with the then long-retired eighty-something-year-old George Trimble through a friend of his at Lockheed Martin, this was the message he received back: "I don't know who this old man is or what he once was, but he told me in no uncertain terms to get off his case. He doesn't want to speak to me, and he doesn't want to speak to you. Not now, not ever." I don't mind telling you that he sounded scared. Did deep black aerospace secretly make a huge breakthrough in anti-gravity? Well, when he worked for Martin in the fifties, Lewis Witten specialized in nonlinear algebra and topological physics—the two things that you'd need to investigate gravity and maybe how to beat it. He also did contract work on gravity for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The reason there was a laboratory at Wright Field was to find out what we were doing and to help us do it. I got a contract from Wright Field to do it, to do gravity, which I did very happily. And who is Louis Witten's son? Ed Witten. Just the most formidable proponent of string theory, maybe of all time. Do you think that string theory, which Ed Witten worked on, is intentionally a bridge to nowhere? I have privately said to you that string theory was a very odd development because it both allowed physics to proceed as if it was doing something new while breaking no new ground in the physical world in which we live. I don't really know if you were trying to stagnate the field; string theory is pretty brilliant.

And remember that Chapel Hill conference that was thrown in 1957 by Agnew Bahnson, who was obsessed with anti-gravity? Well, Louis Witten was there. The conference helped establish quantum gravity, of which string theory is an offshoot. In an interview with the American Institute of Physics, when anti-gravity gets brought up, Louis Witten says a guy named Townsend discovered that there was a type of bismuth that was repelled instead of attracting. There was a vice president of the Martin Company who brought that up. He said, "I read about a guy in Indiana who says the rock of bismuth shows anti-gravity." And where have we heard about bismuth with possible anti-gravity properties before? That's Gary Nolan, a Stanford microbiologist and Nobel nominee, who claims to have UFO crash parts with isotope ratios that don't occur naturally on Earth. One of his pieces that we looked at together when I visited was magnesium bismuth-bismuth layers less than a human hair supposedly picked up in the crash retrieval of an advanced aerospace vehicle. Nowhere could we find any evidence that anybody ever made one of these. And who's this Townsend guy Witten's referring to? Witten had to have been talking about Townsend Brown, one of the country's leading anti-gravity researchers at the time.

Yeah, and there's a guy named Townsend Brown who had a theory that if you took two charged plates and then you put something neutral between them, the neutral thing would sort of gravitate a little towards the positively charged plate. And you could basically figure out anti-gravity. From the outside, Townsend Brown sort of looks like an amateurish mid-century physicist and failed inventor exploring the kooky world of anti-gravity, just to end up failing in creating the intellectual property behind the Ionic Breeze Air Purifier. I'm not joking. But a great biography called **The Man Who Mastered Gravity** by Paul Schatzkin tells the real story.

[48:39 -> 52:26]

David Grusch:

He parachuted behind enemy lines into Germany in 1944 and started looking into the German UFO reverse engineering program. That's crazy. OSS and MI6 super spies Bill Donovan and William Stephenson needed the Allies' preeminent antigravity scientist to investigate the notorious Foo Fighter phenomena. These were bizarre orbs that looked like intelligently controlled ball lightning, popping up all over Germany in the early forties and messing with Allied fighter pilots.

I couldn't find a ton of corroboration outside of Schatzkin's book on this story. But here's why I think it's true. We do know for a fact that Eisenhower sent General James Doolittle to investigate Swedish ghost rockets. These were tons of UFO sightings in Sweden and Finland in the immediate aftermath of world war II. Curiously, Doolittle then went back to the United States just to found the Lindbergh Foundation, which researched novel aviation propulsion methods. So I wouldn't be totally surprised if Townsend Brown was tasked with the same thing regarding Foo Fighters.

I mean, there's some other stuff, too, that I can't talk about that was way before that. So you're like, "Oh, shit." But what did Brown's work in antigravity have to do with UFOs? Well, his gravitator looked

exactly like a flying saucer. He found that circular craft were better for that application than winged craft. And behind closed doors, Townsend Brown was obsessed with UFOs. He even created NICAP, the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena.

When Townsend's daughter, Linda Brown, and his biographer requested the scientist's records from the Navy, they were at first very uncooperative. And then eventually they hinted that a lot of Brown's work was still classified. But why would Brown's work be classified if he was just a failed hack? The National Secrecy Act prevented scientists like T. Townsend Brown from commercializing or even publicizing any technology which could potentially be interpreted as having a military application.

Well, we know from Schatzkin's biography that Brown actually had meetings with the highest-level officials in American atomic programs, people like Edward Teller, the father of the hydrogen bomb, and General Curtis LeMay, both deep insiders when it came to atomic secrets. Townsend Brown's daughter Linda even recalls that he was often taken home in a black Cadillac driven by a man that she would eventually come to know as Robert Sarbacher.

And where have we heard that mysterious name before? Sarbacher, somebody purportedly involved in the stand-up of the stuff that I uncovered. Right? But if you look deeper, things get even weirder with Brown. In the naval records that we do have, it shows that Brown was suddenly terminated by the Navy in 1942 with no explanation, despite strong performance. Two weeks later, he mysteriously pops up as an employee at Martin Corporation in Burbank, just 50 miles from where Skunkworks is founded a year later by legendary aeronautical engineer Kelly Johnson.

Skunkworks was created to house Martin's most advanced, secretive work. Over 80% of its current projects are still classified. Is it a coincidence that Townsend Brown joined Martin Corporation a year before its founding? And guess who else funded Brown? None other than Agnew Bahnson, the same antigravity financier who helped send physics into a dead end by popularizing quantum gravity.

Okay. Okay. Townsend Brown. I'll remember that. I want to look that up. I heard it in one of the documentaries—because there is this golden age of relativity in the fifties, and then everything sort of went silent. And I think that's an interesting axis for you guys to look into. Okay, this is all interesting, but I know, right? We don't have a smoking gun that any of Brown's work...

[52:27 -> 56:05]

David Grusch:

Actually, that got implemented by deep black aerospace. Well, that's actually not true. We kind of do have evidence. In March of 1992, Aviation Week broke a story about the B-2 stealth bomber. It used an electrokinetic effect in its wings, producing a Biefeld-Brown effect. The B-2 surfs its own electrostatic wave, with the negative cloud chasing the positive wing. This is an exact description of Townsend

Brown's work, and the Biefeld-Brown Effect is literally named after him. The B-2 was built by the merged Northrop Grumman, whose major investor, Floyd Odlum, was the same guy that invested in Townsend Brown's company, Guidance Technologies, in the sixties. I guess Townsend Brown isn't just the wacky fan guy anymore.

There's just this parallel history. It's very tightly coupled to what is known publicly, like Operation Paperclip, etc. But there's this other side of it that a lot of it dealt with the UFO and UAP issue in earnest. Operation Paperclip was a secret CIA program that took more than 1,600 former Nazi scientists and engineers and placed them in senior leadership roles in American military, intelligence, and space programs in the wake of World War II. Germans made more progress than anybody at the time, just in aerospace generally. The V-2 flying rocket was 20 to 30 years ahead of anybody—the Me 262 jet fighter and the whole wunderwaffe arsenal. One has to ask why we had such a pressing need to get Wernher von Braun and Arthur Rudolph and all these guys. The NASA Saturn program was literally a transplantation of the Nazi program. Why was there such a pressing need to bring all these people to the U.S.? And, you know, maybe it had something to do with the UFO thing; who knows? Because Wernher von Braun was also a very trippy guy.

Remember that story about Townsend Brown parachuting into Germany to investigate Foo Fighters and Nazi UFO programs? Well, maybe Operation Paperclip had a little more to do with UFOs than meets the eye. Yeah, Paperclip's pretty nuts when you think about it. Ethically and morally, you had people who were war criminals, people who were going to be tried at Nuremberg. Yes, they took off that and then they snatched them and brought them back to the U.S. A lot of them became seniors at what became the CIA and, you know, NASA. And it's like, yeah, I don't know if it would happen nowadays. I feel like we would actually not be able to turn a blind eye to it.

Oh, there's no chance. Yeah, Wernher von Braun oversaw a brutal, mostly Jewish slave labor camp where tons and tons of people died. Yeah. And then he went on to literally run our space program. It's pretty interesting history. Yeah. Like his boss, the German general that von Braun worked for back in Germany, you know, came over and was very high up in NASA.

After so many witnesses, it seemed the so-called flying saucers' existence can no longer be denied. You know, it's kind of like getting red-pilled in the Matrix. Yeah. Oh, holy shit. Reality is way crazier and weirder than I thought. There's more likely people from the program watching your channel than ours.

Maybe. I can tell you that for sure. They're like, this Jesse guy keeps making speculations. He's coming closer and closer. Well, that's the thing; if you have somebody who has great intelligence on this, you should probably bring them in.

[56:06 -> 59:59]
David Grusch:

We shouldn't leave him out there speculating. If you're on the program, mind strictly the nightmare-type reports of flying saucers; they are nothing new. From the beginning of recorded time, men have seen unexplainable things in the sky. Someone told me the other day about this saucer, the flying saucer—someone used that word before it became popular in movies or something. We had the public hearing with the Yes family that was brought up.

Anyone want to—? Yes. Kenneth Arnold, in 1947, two months before Roswell, was looking for a downed cargo plane in Mount Rainier. He saw this kind of saucer skipping, or saucers skipping. They were in a V formation. I think the point of that is that in culture, the term "flying saucer" was not derived from fiction; it's the other way around. Our depiction of aliens and flying saucers was actually derived from people's real-life stories, not the other way around. That's always a misconception.

Yes, but this is an important conversation. I don't know if you have an opinion on this, but books like **American Cosmic** by Diana Pasulka and **Passport to Magonia** by Jacques Vallee do talk about how the cultural mythology of the time—whether it's religion or media—plays a role in shaping how you recollect an experience. A classic example is Betty and Barney Hill in 1961. **Outer Limits** was a CBS show that aired 11 days before that abduction experience, and it showed aliens with eyes that wrapped around the rims of their heads. That's exactly what they described.

Yes, the analytical overlay. It's almost like we discussed before, where you had witches sitting on the chests of people feeling paralyzed in medieval times. Our overlay is this classic alien motif. If you look at what they said before, it's the same phenomenon. Basically, people have different analytical overlays, so they describe it in different ways—leprechauns, fairies, elves, angels, demons. We superimpose our own reality onto these experiences. It's almost like you have a meme library in your head, and then you have this higher, platonic phenomenon happening, and you attach the closest meme that you can to it.

Exactly. People have been seeing the same stuff. The tic-tac of today was the flying butane tank photo of the 1950s. You can find declassified Air Force OSI reports that are publicly searchable right now that talk about these flying white butane tanks. Right. And then you have the Foo Fighter phenomenon in world war II. If you go way back, you see descriptions of similar phenomena in antiquity as well.

So whether it be extraterrestrial or some other kind of origin—crypto-terrestrial, or whatever else people postulate—we deserve to understand the truths of the universe. If we have the answer to one of life's questions, like what happens when we die or are we alone, if we can answer one of those, it would be significant. But it's kept secret because they believe the public can't handle it or that it hinders the Cold War arms race, which I talked about in my first public interview. That seems pretty messed up to me.

what do you think about elite interest in the topic? The Rockefellers funded Steven Greer in the nineties—and John Mack—and John Mack. They also funded the Princeton Parapsychology Lab. Then you have Chris Mellon, who's a Mellon, obviously interested in the subject. I think there are letters between Lawrence Rockefeller and Hillary Clinton in the nineties where he was pushing for disclosure. That's right.

[1:00:00 -> 1:03:33]

David Grusch:

I think it was David Rockefeller who was also involved in that, and it was like a Camp David meetup. There's a photo of that, and it's wild. Certainly, if you use the Rockefellers as the most prominent example, they are certainly called old money elite interests. Maybe it's because of their interest in frontier science, or who knows? I've never talked to the Rockefellers; I have no idea what spurred that interest on, but they were certainly pushing for transparency on the issue. And that's one of the most influential families in America, right?

It is important in any scientific process to try to maintain the null hypothesis for as long as possible. Kuhn, who wrote "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions," talks about this. He was friends with John Mack, who was the head of the Harvard Psychiatry Department. Mack tried to maintain the null hypothesis and said, "I don't think this is real," because he started—he was actually a private clinician. He began to see people who would bring up these alien encounters.

I think the thing that's really important for people is just the amount of credentialed individuals who, once they start to have an open mind and genuinely inquire, usually begin to take it seriously. I have a good friend, Eric Weinstein, who is a well-respected public intellectual. I used to wax poetic, saying, "Hey, look, this is real. I promise you, this is real." He used to think—his quote is like, "This is the one area where you had brain damage. You would not come off of this point." I was convinced that you were brain damaged on this one issue.

Now, I think he oscillates, but he's pretty deep into the history to the point where he's bought in that this is at least something worthy of investigation. There's certainly some scholarship there, whether it be Jacques Vallee or Diana Pasulka recently. Jacques Vallee built the earliest version of the Internet, ARPANET, or he helped with it, along with Doug Engelbart, and he is a serious astronomer. These people have serious backgrounds.

I mean, I was a really hardcore intel guy working on some of the hardest, most deep black stuff. I didn't really think much about UFOs, but then I started looking into it. I have people in tears—naval officers, pilots, etc.—wanting to tell me what they literally saw. Either a lot of people are having psychological breaks, or there's a

lot of weird weather phenomena that manifest themselves in physical, tangible, metallic-looking craft that are close. That seems crazy to me.

I'm like, well, these people deeply believe what they saw, and I have to take them seriously. So we need to figure out what this phenomenon is. Carl Jung wrote a book called "Flying Saucers," where he talks about flying saucers as a kind of mandala, the Sanskrit symbol of psychic completeness. It's this proto-psychological desire for us to have this kind of revelation of knowing everything all at once.

What was crazy about it is that he wrote the book and said this is just kind of a symbolic psychological archetype. Then afterwards, he became convinced that the phenomena were actually real. There are things flying around up there that we haven't fully identified yet. Roswell is a very interesting place with a lot of people who would like to know what's going on. There's footage and records of objects.

[1:03:36 -> 1:07:28]

Speaker:

In the skies, there are phenomena that we don't fully understand. We observed a bright light appear in the distant western skies. At this point in the video, you might be thinking there is a considerable amount of evidence for UFOs. So why are people so reflexively and often smugly dismissive of the topic? The common response is, "No to predictions, no to aliens."

On one hand, it's a fair reaction. There are numerous profit-driven and attention-seeking charlatans in this space—individuals who have no genuine interest in pursuing the truth, embellishing stories, and selling snake oil for a living. Additionally, there are counterintelligence efforts that continuously throw smoke bombs to confuse the public and divert attention from the truth.

However, perhaps the most significant point regarding the stigma surrounding UFOs is that some of the most prominent skeptics over the last 50 years—those who have done the most damage to open research on the topic—were, you guessed it, involved in atomic programs. These same atomic programs, as Dave has indicated, were responsible for initially studying UFOs and subsequently establishing their secrecy.

It's fascinating to note that some of the most notable debunkers, such as Menzel, Condon, and H.P. Robertson, were influential figures who also worked on the Manhattan Project. Condon, in particular, was deeply involved.

Oh, I didn't realize that.

Oh yes, he collaborated extensively with Vannevar Bush.

Edward Euler Condon was a mid-century quantum physicist, and no single individual is more responsible for the marginalization of UFOs than he and his infamous Condon Committee. This 1966 investigation into UFOs was funded but was supposed to be uninfluenced by the Air Force. However, we now know that Condon was actually coordinating closely

with Air Force officials, such as Colonel Robert Hippler, who had expressed a clear desire in writing that all previous UFO research be dismissed as a waste of money.

The Condon Committee's report effectively dealt a death blow to UFO research in the latter half of the 20th century. The backstory here is that Condon was deeply entrenched in the world of atomic secrets. Not only did he study with Robert Oppenheimer under Max Born in Germany during the 1920s, but he is sometimes credited with helping Oppenheimer select Los Alamos as the site for the Manhattan Project.

Condon was familiar with the area, having grown up nearby in Alamogordo. He also recruited many of the project's early staff and authored the Los Alamos Primer, a document that all employees were required to read before their arrival.

In 1946, Condon assisted in drafting the McMahon Atomic Energy Act, which, as Dave asserts, established the framework for UFO secrecy. The McMahon Act of 1946 was the predecessor to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The individuals involved in the Manhattan Project were overlaying the same ecosystem of secrecy in similar ways to protect nuclear secrets.

Thus, Condon was likely aware of high-level UFO secrets from the very beginning. How many individuals were deterred from studying UFOs because this one prestigious quantum physicist declared it a waste of time?

So, was Condon merely an insider who knew the truth about UFOs, and was he used by the original atomic UFO programs and the Air Force to downplay the subject?

Bob Lazar claimed he worked at a secret facility near Groom Lake, where alien technology was being reverse-engineered. Do you think Bob Lazar is credible?

Bob Lazar is undoubtedly the most famous case of someone who publicly claims to have secretly worked on reverse engineering UFOs. He came forward in 1989 and has remained a controversial figure ever since.

[1:07:30 -> 1:11:13]

Interviewer:

David Grusch's story has been remarkably consistent, even while detractors claim he possibly faked his educational credentials at MIT. He recently appeared on Joe Rogan's podcast, and it's still this bizarre split where many people are saying he was right. Your testimony is now being used to say he's totally vindicated. However, the verdict is still out because many ufologists and UFO enthusiasts that I respect remain skeptical. Do you have a take on this?

David Grusch:

Yeah, I mean, I'm certainly different from him. I came at it from a different angle. I have no information on Bob Lazar; it wasn't within the scope of my investigations. If he actually experienced what he

claims, I literally have no idea. Honestly, I go back and forth on whether Bob Lazar is telling the truth all the time. On one hand, the guy sells illicit chemicals on a sketchy website, invested in a brothel, and seems like a petty conman and criminal. But on the other hand, he definitely has some engineering prowess. He strapped a jet engine to the back of his Honda, he may have actually met with Edward Teller, and he probably did some work at Los Alamos.

Finally, his story just seems so consistent. He really doesn't seem like a guy who thinks he's lying. Look, there's a lot of weird stuff about the Bob Lazar story. His narrative has been absolutely consistent since the late 1980s. It's a classic intelligence tactic to provide people with 95% correct information and 5% false information. You can track the flow of information by the uniquely false details in it, which can easily discredit the leak. Bob Lazar has associated with some interesting characters, like John Lear, who flew cargo planes for the CIA in the seventies. Lear definitely seemed to spread disinformation in other cases. He was also the son of Bill Lear, the inventor of the Learjet, who may have been involved in the original UFO program.

My question is, did John Lear manipulate Lazar into spreading a bunch of pure disinformation? Was Lazar's claim that he worked on UFOs all a complete lie? Or was Lazar just a disclosure test for Lear and others around him? Let's see how the public reacts to this guy. He's easy to discredit, but he might be mostly telling the truth. Personally, I'm not sure what to think and would love to meet Lazar myself to ask him about the liquid he claimed he was made to drink, the memory lapses it caused, and his relationship with John Lear.

There's probably a small contingency out there that believes the U.S. needs to maintain primacy. You have this exotic technology that we've found, you know, in the case of whatever crashes have occurred. We don't know exactly what to do with it. Maybe we made more progress early on than we have now. We need to refresh the talent pool and perhaps reveal ourselves as a program to front-run immunity through legislation. What do you say to those people?

Yeah, because I mean, that's something I tried to espouse on News Nation. I can't remember how they edited it, but it actually hurts national supremacy to keep it obtusely secret.

Yeah, that's what I'm saying. You can't even bring the right people on board. You know, say the best theoretician in quantum thermodynamics just happens to smoke marijuana, so he can't get a clearance and can't get on the program. So it actually hurts national security by not opening it up, at least in an appropriate way that doesn't compromise anything that could be used illicitly to harm people.

But at least, and that's why I used the nuclear physics example. The program should want to out itself.

Yeah. It's like, yeah, protect what could be weaponized.

[1:11:14 -> 1:14:47]

David Grusch:

To be studied openly. But there's absolutely no cogent plan that I'm aware of to do so. Congressman, do you think that these reverse engineering programs have made any progress?

Interviewer:

Yeah, I do. I just don't think they're going to scratch the surface—because if they did, we would own the skies if they had it. Isn't it in their best interest to just get immunity for themselves and try to refresh the talent pool? If these people are, you know, they're all old and it's completely compartmentalized, and they haven't made any progress.

David Grusch:

And the Wilson memo. They're completely arrogant. They're arrogant. Blatantly arrogant. They're above the laws. Why aren't they releasing the Kennedy files? Nobody's allowed in sixty years, but every president—do you think there's a connection between that and this?

Interviewer:

I heard, I've heard that. I would hate to speculate. I'm more just—I want it to surface. Just give me the start.

David Grusch:

Gotcha. Thank you. We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. I have no idea if JFK's death had anything to do with UFOs. But there is a letter that was supposedly declassified due to a Freedom of Information Act request in 2006. It was from JFK to the director of the CIA at the time, John McCone. Its date? November 12th, 1963, just ten days before the president's assassination.

In the letter, JFK is asking for the full data on unknowns or UFOs so we can coordinate more tightly with the Russians in space. And they don't mistake these UFOs as acts of American aggression or reconnaissance. I've called the guy who used the Freedom of Information Act to retrieve this document like five times now, and he's not playing ball. So I have no idea if this document is real.

An anonymous archivist that handles a lot of JFK's letters says that there are some anomalies in the letter that make him skeptical. So who knows? But I will say this is a very weird non-sequitur from former CIA Director Mike Pompeo when asked why the nearly 5,000 JFK files still won't be released to this day.

Interviewer:

Why did you fight to keep the JFK files secret?

David Grusch:

These don't hold the dark secrets that everybody wants to just hold up as the boogeyman. I saw the UFO files, too. We've got bigger problems.

Interviewer:

What do you say to the people who say this is a psyop and they just want black budget funding? So the information might be right, but they just want to be able to have increased surveillance in the skies and in space or whatever.

David Grusch:

Yeah, that comes up, I think, with some people that have an issue with it. Where you had to remember, like, national security threat is the way to get Congress alerted and engaged. That is like the operative word that Congress responds to—the narrative that this could be a threat.

Because, look, to be honest with you, I think this stuff's been going on for thousands of years. And so it does frustrate me a little bit when it's like, you know, we need to be able to shoot these things down. It's like, I don't think they're really an immediate existential threat, as is my strong bias. It might not be the smartest idea to try to fire back when they're not firing at you. They'll take you out real quick if they can fly faster than light and do all the stuff they're doing.

So yeah, it's probably not a good idea. We probably shouldn't attack the zookeeper.

Interviewer:

Yeah, exactly.

David Grusch:

Don't attack the zookeeper. Like, that's probably not a good idea. Stick to the facts, write it down, and don't speculate what you think it is because it will sway your decision. The thing that frustrated me about the hearing was, look, I think Ryan Graves is awesome. And I think as is Commander David Fravor.

[1:14:47 -> 1:18:41]

David Grusch:

I think they're showing a lot of courage. But it felt like their simple takeaway is that we need more sensors, a better collection process, and a more standardized taxonomy, all of which are very important. However, it's this kind of lazy data story that I think comes from Silicon Valley, where the belief is that if we just get a bigger database of UFOs, a machine learning classifier will somehow spit out the answer as to what they are.

The only thing you're going to get from external observation, at least through the lens I look through, is what they call activity-based intelligence, or ABI. You'll figure out where the true hotspots are, but it's not the end-all, be-all. If you're trying to find a needle in a haystack, you don't want to add to the haystack. I think we are over-indexed on data—yeah, saturated with data in some ways—and it could probably be better standardized. So I'll give them that.

But we're under-indexed on theory, and to my mind, we have one pretty strong theoretician: Jacques Vallee. If you read "The Invisible College," which he wrote in 1975, that is the tip of the spear now in terms of theory on UFOs, which is wild to me. Jacques Vallee might be the most preeminent UFO researcher in the world. In fact, he was Steven Spielberg's inspiration for the eccentric French scientist played by François Truffaut in "Close Encounters of the Third Kind."

Nobody's really replaced him at that level, especially with hypotheses that are even a little more testable. What the average person might not know about Jacques is that he's obsessed with time travel. In fact, on the set of "Close Encounters," he got into an argument with Steven Spielberg. They had a long discussion about what UFOs could be. For Spielberg, the main point of the movie was entertainment, and it was appropriate for the UFOs to be extraterrestrial visitors. Jacques wanted the UFOs and the aliens in the movie to be represented in a more nuanced way, actually linked with time travel, not just space travel.

I think that the extraterrestrial hypothesis is actually more far-fetched. The idea that another species would evolutionarily converge to be bipedal, to have kind of the symmetric bilateral symmetry, seems pretty rare. If we look at the Ariel School event, if we believe the 100 schoolchildren who saw bipedal, hominid-looking beings, that seems pretty rare to have the same development.

It's either extraterrestrial, and we're seeing bioengineered beings that look similar to us for ease of communication and acceptance, maybe? That is almost like an avatar for the intelligence behind the ghost in the machine or whatever. They were engineered specifically to look like that, and it wasn't natural. Jacques' heir in the UFO theory world is a guy named Mike Masters, a biological anthropologist at Montana Tech University, who believes that aliens are basically just humans from the future who figured out time travel and are going back in time to visit us in the present.

We see them less often because we're just one small blip on their geographic map of time. I like this sort of beings-from-the-future hypothesis for a few reasons. There's actually a concept in evolutionary biology called neoteny, where your distant offspring looks like your kids currently. If you think about a lot of these close encounters of the third kind, they are often described as beings that are somewhat childlike in nature.

If you consider how we're actually evolving as a species, our bodies are becoming somewhat vestigial. We have an abundant amount of resources that are being distributed to us; we don't need them...

[1:18:42 -> 1:22:31]

David Grusch:

Our morphologies are going to change, just wither away a little bit, and then our brains are becoming actually more important. Decision-making is becoming more important. If we have any sort of latent intuitive powers, that's going to be more important. These

beings are supposedly a little more telepathic. Their eyes are sort of slits. You're going to have more screen time going forward. It does feel like that's kind of the way that we're evolving.

Aliens are weirdly non-interventionist. In many of the abductions that get reported, it's almost like they have a prime directive to not say or do too much. In fact, in many cases, Mike Masters studied that the abductees had to sanitize themselves, shower, or do chemical rinses before boarding the alien craft. This would make sense as time travel involves all sorts of issues, like the grandfather paradox. You can't go back in time and kill your own grandfather; otherwise, how would you exist in the present?

Any little thing you do in the past might dramatically change timelines or trajectories in a way that breaks the present. So maybe this alien non-interventionism points further towards the time travel theory. Many abductees also report lost time. Again, this might be explained by abductions occurring in another temporal dimension.

Time is crazy because, you know, it's defined at some levels as the Planck length, right? It's the time it takes for a photon of light to cross. Planck literally, after discovering the Planck length, thought that would be the best way to communicate with aliens because it's literally the shortest length. He would joke about that. So yeah, it's all relative, right? It's based on your reference frames, especially if you're near a gravitational source.

General relativity teaches us that clocks either speed up or slow down based on where they are near a gravitational source or not. You know, $1/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$ over distance, and it comes off. We've proven that having cesium clocks on airplanes in the seventies showed atomic clock differences based on the force of gravity.

Yeah, time is really not a constant the way we conceptualize it; it's not constant at all. And yet the felt sense of it is constant. Maybe true ontological reality is that time is way trippier than we realize. And maybe that speaks to this sort of alien phenomenon, especially because people seem to see crafts and aliens when they're in specific kinds of heightened states of consciousness.

So maybe time doesn't work quite the way we think it does. But in ordinary consciousness, we sort of snap it into this kind of linear classical epistemology that we experience. That's what I was trying to espouse upon when I mentioned the holographic principle. If you want to imagine a 3D object, such as yourself, casting a shadow onto a 2D surface, that's the holographic principle. You can be quasi-projected from higher-dimensional space to lower-dimensional space.

It's a scientific trope that you can actually cross. Originally, the holographic principle was created to explain how information is encoded on an event horizon in a black hole. But maybe that's what we're seeing; we're seeing higher-dimensional stuff casting shadows into our space, just like how we cast a shadow on a two-dimensional surface, which is like the sidewalk, right?

well, if you were on flat land, you would have no idea that this crazy 3D monster was out there. But all you're seeing is the shadow. It's called quasi-projection. And then maybe some of the UAPs are not even here, but they're not actually from out there. I cannot show you a tesseract because I and you...

[1:22:31 -> 1:26:06]

David Grusch:

We are trapped in three dimensions. But what I can show you is the shadow in three dimensions of a four-dimensional hypercube, or tesseract. This is it. If it exists outside of four-dimensional time-space or whatever, say this is, you know, you have a two-dimensional universe and this is a three-dimensional object. If it intersects, you're just going to see a sliver of it. So you'll just see a disk. That would make sense, I think, in two ways. One is that a lot of people who seem to see crafts and sometimes, quote unquote, go inside of them, report that the inside is bigger than the outside.

Jacques Vallee describes a woman in San Jose who saw a flying saucer. She walked in and suddenly found herself in a movie theater. In one case in good old San Jose, a woman saw something over her house; it was a big disk. When I asked her about her experience inside, she described a being who took her on a staircase. I asked her where the staircase went, and she said it went up the side of this big round room. When I asked her to compare it, she said it was like a movie house, you know, like an amphitheater. I pointed out that this space was bigger than her house. Why is the inside bigger than the outside?

This is a constant theme. If we're looking for patterns, that would make sense if it's this shadow casting. That almost sounds like a physical translation from a lower to a higher dimensional space. That seems to be what's going on there. I don't know if we have a good framework on how to smoothly do something like that.

I think if anyone would know about aliens on Earth, it would probably be me. He's hopping on the alien bandwagon as of the last two days, by the way. Well, he did, and then he said, "Somebody should win the psy-op of the year award or something." So I don't know what it's like. What do you think, man? What's your take?

He was just riding the fear with the first tweet of, "I'm not going to say they're aliens, but..." Yeah, I'm not sure what's going on with him. I think he's probably a little upset because he's using chemical propulsion.

Exactly. We need the Howard Hughes of our generation to get access to the good stuff. I've always found it fascinating that America's real-life Iron Man, its most impressive industrialist, seems to be so sure that we're in a simulation. The odds that we're in base reality are one in billions, but he doesn't like entertaining any possible sightings of aliens. If we're in a simulation, why aren't you speculating about who simulated us? I mean, if they show up, I'm like, great, okay, now this is new information.

The conventional story, especially after the Copernican revolution, is that the Earth is a lucky accident that allows for life. You do have sort of weird aspects of reality, like the anthropic principle. For instance, if Planck's constant were slightly different, or if hydrogen bonded with oxygen in a different way that didn't form these perfect crystal structures, ice wouldn't float above water. Usually, solids sink below liquids, and we wouldn't have a habitable Earth.

So you have all these aspects of physics that, if they were slightly different, we wouldn't have this sort of Goldilocks perfect habitable zone.

Oh, yeah. I mean, Earth is very finely tuned, right? The temperature gradient is just enough. Is that a coincidence, or did aliens set this up? I don't know. You can even think of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, where you can't measure position and momentum at the same time.

[1:26:07 -> 1:29:59]

David Grusch:

As a computational caching function, you can't compute everything. Your RAM's not that good. And maybe if we are in a simulation, our perceptive capabilities were artificially limited by the simulators. We only see between 400 and 700 nanometers of the electromagnetic wave spectrum. We only hear certain frequencies. That's why dog whistles are inaudible to humans. If we really wanted to create safe artificial general intelligence, we might initially experiment with artificial life so limited in its perception that it doesn't even know we exist. So it definitely can't hurt us. Forward-looking infrared caught the famous Tic Tac video in 2004. What if we had infrared sensors, or for that matter, gravity wave detectors in our pockets? How many more sightings would we have? That explains why UFOs are disproportionately picked up by military bases. It's the robust multi-sensory detection that you find on those bases that makes all the difference. There is no understanding of alien visits that has them only visit restricted Navy airspace to be picked up by pilots. It's an observer and collection bias issue, where you have all the eyeballs and all the sensors in those areas.

Interviewer:

That's a good point. You know, if you were to do an activity-based intelligence across the globe, if we actually can have an open and honest kind of collection system...

David Grusch:

Yeah. I think we'd probably see some hotspots that don't even make any sense. You know, I don't like throwing shade, but like Neil deGrasse Tyson, right?

Interviewer:

Oh, yeah. He's made up his mind.

David Grusch:

I've read his tweets and I'm like, "Dude, you have a Ph.D. in physics? Where's your curiosity?" I can't even believe there's no evidence that would convince an authentic skeptic. I have credentials too, and I'm happy to go toe to toe with you.

Interviewer:

Yeah. If he wants to debate me, I'd be fine with that.

David Grusch:

You know, when I started studying physics in college, and I became an intel guy, I got briefed on a lot of programs. I figured, oh, I would know if it's a thing. I kind of ascribe to the Enrico Fermi thing where, you know, wouldn't it be obvious? Wouldn't they just be flying and they wouldn't care, and they would just land and say hello? But that's like an overly simplistic thought, you know—humanistic too.

Interviewer:

Very humanistic.

David Grusch:

You're assuming that they have the same kind of intent as us. You assume they operate in the electromagnetic spectrum that we can observe normally. And then also you're assuming that they would want this kind of open, obvious interaction and they're not doing cover concealment techniques, where they're obfuscating their activity because maybe they're observing us for some purpose. Or what if they're von Neumann probes, right? Do you guys know von Neumann probes?

Interviewer:

No. Von Neumann replicators?

David Grusch:

Well, just like self-replicating tech that, if that's disposable in nature, if you're trying to send something out simple and engineered to explore the cosmos. And there's always a question of like what was the first self-replicating organism? I think the big mystery is how does chemistry turn into biology? And we have these people that say, "Oh, it was just this primordial soup," and you had all these chemicals kind of like floating around. They've done experiments like this and never been able to recreate life through those experiments. It's a really open question, like how did life form? And I think it's probably much more trippy and interesting than just a chemical soup, just the chemicals happen to bond in a certain way. It's a happy accident. And Crick's view was that DNA could not have emerged accidentally from the primeval soup on this planet in just 100 million years. It needed much longer to—he still bought into the primeval.

[1:30:01 -> 1:33:04]

David Grusch:

The idea of a primordial soup, but not on this planet, is intriguing. What it comes down to is that there must have been some other planet somewhere where a primordial soup existed, and there had been enough

time for DNA to emerge from the accidental bumping together of molecules. By the way, I'm a bit skeptical of that concept. There's actually a French evolutionary theorist and philosopher named Henri Bergson who believed that the sun was essential to evolution. If you think about it, that makes sense—mutations are necessary for evolution to occur. You need genetic mutations, and the sun emits radiation, including ultraviolet light.

Why are we worried about a Japanese nuclear spill? What happened at Fukushima and Chernobyl? Those events led to an acceleration of evolution due to radiation. Perhaps the sun is an extremely sophisticated nuclear fusion reactor that powers the Earth, and the Earth's electromagnetic field was designed to support life. Astronauts often have to take Schumann resonance machines with them to space to mimic the Earth's electromagnetic field; otherwise, their bodies can malfunction.

For instance, if you place a frog embryo in a Faraday cage, it does not develop normally. Additionally, if you alter the cell gradient of a tadpole—say, by severing its arm—you can manipulate the cell gradients of the head cells and potentially grow a chimeric two-headed tadpole. There seems to be something about the electromagnetic field that is orthogonal and perhaps even upstream of DNA in terms of morphology.

They've also conducted experiments with plant growth around high-powered Wi-Fi routers, and the results are concerning. Plants do not grow properly in those conditions. I often think about the Wi-Fi in my house and wonder if I am slowly harming myself.

What's the name of the llama?

Playboy.

I think the name of the llama was Boy.

Over the past few days, you shared with us that you were diagnosed as being on the autism spectrum. How has this served you in your life and career, and how has it hindered you?

I didn't know I was autistic until I was in my early thirties. It has served me well in the government because I excelled at intelligence work. For example, when I was tasked with targeting a facility, I would be given six months to figure out everything, and I was able to do that effectively.

[1:33:05 -> 1:35:56]

Interviewer:

But I think especially if you're trying to maintain relationships, it's important to understand how to read people's emotions and how to express your own emotions. Autistic individuals, particularly those deeper on the spectrum, such as those with Asperger's, often struggle with presenting their emotions to a partner or spouse.

He would come home and share general thoughts, and I would respond, "Yeah, that makes sense. There are probably aliens; that makes sense." Unfortunately, Dave can't discuss the backlash he's received from

within the government due to an ongoing investigation. However, a good example of a despicable attempt at marginalization from the outside was an article written a few weeks after the hearing by The Intercept.

The article described Dave's hospitalization back in 2018, which involved alcohol consumption and suicidal ideation that led to a 911 call. However, it failed to mention any of the factors that contributed to this incident. Dave has been very open with us and other media about his PTSD from combat experiences, including the loss of a close friend while on duty. I had a friend who died doing the same work, and just six months later, I was going to the same locations.

He has also discussed the suffering that resulted from that experience and the proactive techniques he has used to heal from that trauma, such as EMDR therapy and HRV breath work. I was initially skeptical, but I found it to be incredibly effective for me. I highly recommend anyone dealing with similar issues to try these methods, as they may seem nontraditional but can be very valuable.

Critiquing the substance of Dave's argument, some have claimed that his information is secondhand or high-level, which is within the public and media's right to discuss. However, the article was a clear cheap shot—a low blow that I suspect was driven by a political ulterior motive aimed at concealing the truth.

People will send me memes or TikToks, and I often respond, "Yep, that's mine." During your time in the Navy, have you ever encountered something you couldn't explain? We have a cabin up in the mountains, and our former neighbor was very interested in seeing UFOs. He even moved to Roswell, New Mexico, because he wanted to be close to the phenomenon. He claimed to have seen something.

Another question I frequently receive is, "why is it always an American thing? why does this phenomenon seem to be happening primarily in America?"

[1:35:56 -> 1:38:26]

David Grusch:

The phenomenon is global, 100%. I mean, you look at aerial schools; Russians have reported stuff. The Chinese have what they call the Journal of UFO Research, which is a published periodical in the People's Republic of China. And you have to remember, the CCP does not allow fringe beliefs, and it's basically tacitly endorsed and allowed since, I think, the late nineties, I want to say.

Do you think the Three-Body Problem, kind of the dark forest analogy of aliens, was maybe sort of a form of soft disclosure from the Chinese government? I mean, I don't know for sure, but they've allowed this sci-fi series to be published by this Chinese author that's pretty trippy. And I don't know, maybe that's a way for the Chinese government to acclimatize the populace.

Do note in the South China Morning Post, I want to say it was June 2021, they had an article like, "Oh yeah, we have a UAP task force too. We're using AIML to look at UAP sightings," and that's really been their own overt messaging on UAP, at least to an English-speaking audience. Oh yeah, we understand that's a problem. We have a task force too.

Isn't what's happening in Ukraine kind of an argument against the practical application of these technologies? Because if either side wanted to definitively win, and you had this kind of faster-than-light travel thing, well, you'd have to be willing to reveal your ace in the hole tech, because once you use it, then you burn it. And then now everybody knows. Gotcha.

Perhaps this is a good time to talk about the frame of the public debate on UFOs, which is frustratingly stupid and simplistic. It's frozen between a sensationalist, indiscriminate belief in everything and smug, elitist dismissiveness. The whole conversation is basically, is this a psyop or is this real? The answer is it's both. Those two things aren't mutually exclusive. In fact, if the phenomena is real, there are more likely to be psyops surrounding it. And those psyops are going to be more effective if the phenomena is real.

And yeah, if there are vehicles in the sky running circles around American state-of-the-art fighter jets, do you not think the government would try to get in front of that narrative and at times use it for its own purposes? We know the Air Force tried to marginalize UFOs with Blue Book, but later in 1979, the Air Force drove a man crazy by playing up his belief in aliens. Paul Bennewitz—I'm sure you're familiar with him?

Interviewer:
I've heard about it, yeah.

[1:38:28 -> 1:41:22]

David Grusch:

There has been some strange craft activity, and we didn't know what it was. Richard Doty, who is an Air Force disinformation officer, was assigned to mentally disrupt him. We know that UFOs are part of a psychological operation; that's old news. The real question is, is this only a psychological operation? Because if it is, it contradicts everything we know about our rather dysfunctional government. It would essentially be the best psychological operation of all time. It spans across government agencies that don't always get along, involves Presidents from both sides of the aisle, and includes fighter pilots and radar operators who adhere to a culture of humility. Of course, there are also hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of average civilians involved.

The null hypothesis that this is purely a psychological operation is almost harder to defend than simply admitting the existence of non-human intelligence. However, you shouldn't blindly trust me or Dave Grusch for that matter. Do your own research.

Consider people like Steven Pinker, who claim that this is the best we've ever had it. I think that's nonsense. Sure, maybe violence is at an all-time low, but that's because we have nuclear weapons now. Any war would lead to mutually assured destruction. If there is a world beyond the material realm that can somehow be accessed or communicated with, it might be a sort of crazy Hail Mary, but you have to throw the Hail Mary now; you can't just run the ball.

Is there something you would like to say directly to someone on the program? If you're on the program, I understand empathetically the risks you face and what you put yourself through. We're trying to create an environment where we can bring this information to light, recruit better people, and hopefully protect those who want to come forward.

If you want to come forward, there is a legal process available, either through PPD 19 if it's an intelligence matter, or through other inspector generals. You have the right to go directly to Congress. Some of the senior leaders who have known about this information were in positions where they had to make decisions, just like anyone else, and they are not at the top of the pyramid.

I believe the time is right to submit your final legacy and to help out, even though I know there may be some admissions regarding decisions you've made in the past that you might wish you hadn't. But I think it's time to move forward. I believe we will be stronger as a nation and as a world. This will enhance national security and improve peer competition policing, ensuring that people aren't engaging in unethical and immoral actions. If everything remains secret, everyone can get away with things that might be illegal, unethical, or immoral. We need to hold our adversaries accountable publicly if this is something we choose to acknowledge.

[1:41:25 -> 1:44:01]

David Grusch:

And once again, nuclear physics is broadly studied. Nuclear weapons development is classified. That's all I have to say.

Do you think, in some ways, UFOs are like a Rorschach test? The way I mean that is, you could use them as an auspice to sort of clamp down and create one world government or something. You could create extra surveillance and say, "This is a big threat," and, "We're not at the top of the food chain; they're apex predators." We have to be careful—watch your step.

Or they can be incredibly libertarian because, actually, terrestrial governments aren't as powerful as we thought they were. I think it could go in either direction. Or perhaps they are just waiting until we genuinely care about this. We look at it, think, "Huh, that's interesting," and then go about our day without integrating the phenomenon into our lives.

In terms of people's reactions to this, look, I'm angry about possible white-collar crime, especially regarding people possibly being driven

crazy or to their death. That's horrible. I also think, on some level, people are too focused on government recrimination. It is time for transparency. Transparency. Transparency. Transparency.

And not just on the fact that this is the nature of reality. These things might make you a biblical literalist. Do you believe that the phenomenon is the next big great religion in the world?

Yeah, basically. The phenomenon has probably already influenced all the other religions, so maybe we're looking at the source code. If you're looking at the source code, we're at the graphical user interface level. It's like the IP header, and we're finally getting into the information flow.

In her book, **American Cosmic**, Diana Pasulka makes a pretty convincing case that many seemingly divine contact experiences in the past could have actually been what we now call UFO experiences. Just take the case of Saint Francis of Assisi. His close confidant, Brother Leo, documents the experience, describing fury, creating atmospheric sparks, a spinning disk, and telepathic communication between Francis and the disc. Then, Francis is wounded by rays of light. He interprets these hand wounds as the stigmata of Christ. But Pasulka speculates that maybe this was just radiation damage from a UFO experience.

[1:44:06 -> 1:46:39]

David Grusch:

I was reasonably religious, but nothing like crazy—kind of average. I studied physics and became somewhat agnostic. I thought, "Eh, I don't know about all this woo-woo stuff that the church espouses." Oddly enough, I've come full circle in some sense. There seems to be this higher sentience; I think we're created beings in some manner, whether it be some panspermia from little G gods or big G gods. I reflect on the journey I've had and the most random people I've known who were placed in my life, like 14 years ago. You know, someone shut the door in my office at NSA and said, "Look, dude." They started telling me all this stuff about what I was involved in and brought these crazy intel reports. I guess I was kind of the right person chosen to do this thing. So, yeah, I've come full circle in my belief system.

For me, it's inspiring because it presents this idea that life isn't just about eating, drinking, and being merry. You live, you pay taxes, you work a job, and then you die—that's the meaning of life. The Vatican Observatory has said they are open to the idea of other sentient life, which shows that God paints with a broad brush. That's pretty cool. The Catholic Church is very accepting of that, and it demonstrates God's providence and creative powers if there are indeed other interesting sentient beings besides us.

It would be a total waste of space if it were just us, right? That's like the famous line in the movie "Contact." Carl Sagan was a great communicator, probably one of the best. He also met with Kit Green towards the end of his career and became very interested in UFOs.

Interviewer:

You were telling me that; I didn't even know that.

David Grusch:

You can count on Jesse to tell you these weird facts. I thought I had a lot of useless knowledge, but this guy's like—it's not useless, but it's pretty useless until now. This is like the mega interview. We're covering every potential trippy, esoteric, conspiratorial thing at once.

This justifies my paranoia in my room, reading about weird stuff and being criticized by friends and colleagues for years. Yeah, this is more you educating me than me saying anything right now. So yeah, it's kind of cool. I'm always learning something when I'm talking to you. Sometimes I hang up the phone and...

[1:46:40 -> 1:49:30]

David Grusch:

You called me, and I thought, "I don't know about this guy." I felt like he was really going deep, and I wondered if he was losing his grip. But oh my God, that was a crazy hummingbird. Maybe it's a DARPA spy cam or something. Oh man, that's a good sign, bro. It shows the difference between my mind and yours.

It brings science and religion together in a way that these two realms have been cleaved or bifurcated since the Enlightenment. This could possibly reconcile those two aspects, which would be absolutely amazing. You could read the Bible and say that some of this stuff could actually happen in the context of aliens—like panspermia and creationism. This might actually prove certain religious texts and what they espouse, like the concept of little "g" gods.

At least for me, spiritually, my belief system has certainly opened my eyes to the idea that the universe is not clockwork. Everything we see in our day-to-day life is not all that exists. If there are truly other sentient intelligences, it inspires my curiosity. I would like to know what their belief systems are and how they might align with ours. Perhaps it could bolster our understanding.

Maybe we can ascend to a higher level, as you mentioned in your video about the Berkshires. Do you want to repeat that? The end result was whether the universe is ignoring us because we haven't reached their level yet. We haven't attained that height of awareness as a society or as a people. Is this an opportunity for us to examine ourselves and figure out why we have not been part of this larger ecosystem?

We have an interesting friend visiting us—non-human intelligence. We have evidence of non-human intelligence. One of the most powerful witness testimonies I've encountered in all the interviews I've consumed over the past three years was from one of the girls involved in the Ariel school case when Dr. John Mack was interviewing her. He was trying to understand how the telepathy was working, and then she said out of nowhere, "I think in space there's no love, but down here there is."

That's reminiscent of near-death experiences, like in "Proof of Heaven" by Dr. Eben Alexander. He has a fascinating scientific perspective on his near-death experience, describing an overarching, loving energy. When he ascended to what sounded like another dimensional plane, he had a fasciitis of the brain, which meant he was likely going to be brain dead if he survived at all. But he miraculously came back.

[1:49:32 -> 1:51:43]

David Grusch:

He was totally fine. But all this knowledge and all the stuff he experienced—that's a super common theme in alien abduction experiences. Whether it's the Ariel school or Commander George Hoover of the Navy, who actually talked about this, aliens often come down and say, "You don't know how powerful you are. You don't know how amazing and powerful you are."

In many mystery rituals, like the Eleusinian mystery rituals and others, you experience a sort of noesis. It's often accompanied by a near-death experience or something similar. You gain knowledge of your primordial soul, and you enter this loving state. Then you come back down, and there is this sort of à la Jesus translation function issue. He was known to speak in riddles and mysteries.

There's a great book called "Flatland" by Sir Edwin Abbott, which is a classic from the late 19th century. It illustrates how, if you were a 3D person speaking to people in Flatland on a 2D plane, or like Plato's cave—you see the light, you come down, and you can't really tell people, and then you get persecuted.

He said he had this knowledge and understood it when he was in that plane. But when he came back and tried to verbalize it and write it down, he could not find the human words to translate it. It's almost as if our symbol rate is too slow to communicate the information effectively.

We're living in a very interesting time. I'm excited to see where it goes. And you're playing a massive part in it, so I appreciate everything. Your service, on a fundamental level, is commendable. You're a real example of a modern Mr. Smith Goes to Washington, and you're not doing it in a reckless, wrecking-ball sort of way. You're going through the proper processes and doing things legally.

But you also have agency, and you're doing it strategically time and again. People often get neutered when they're in government, but you are doing something significant, which is inspiring for young people to see.

Thank you, Dave. Thank you for everything, man. We talked about a lot of things.

Ladies and gentlemen, Neil Armstrong. Today we have with us a group of students among America's best. There are great ideas undiscovered and breakthroughs available to those who can remove one of truth's

protective layers.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JLZzDhDYMcw>
[00:00 -> 03:34]

Narrator:

For the first time, a former senior military intelligence officer comes forward to say what we've only imagined is true. You are saying to the human race for the first time, we are not alone. We're definitely not alone. Claims that our government has proof of alien life: we have spacecraft from another species.

David Grusch:
We do, yeah.

Narrator:
How many?

David Grusch:
Quite a number. Some are landed, some are crashed. Allegations of a secret government program that has hidden the truth and the technology from the world. There's a sophisticated disinformation campaign targeting the U.S. populace, which is extremely unethical and immoral, and it's totally frightening. From Roswell to the present day, there are non-praxis cases—100 unexplainable. I mean, this is like tangible technical craft they're seeing. Is this decorated officer a liar? Why should we believe you? A fool? Is it possible that you're deluding yourself or a hero?

David Grusch:
I'm a patriot, and I believe in the truth to power in this. We're talking about the biggest secret in human history.

Narrator:
We are not alone. The UFO whistleblower speaks.

Elizabeth Vargas:
Good evening. I'm Elizabeth Vargas, here to bring you a NewsNation exclusive interview with a man we're calling the UFO whistleblower. David Grusch is a career intelligence official who this week is making some bombshell claims of a U.S. government cover-up going back nearly a century, shedding light, he says, on that existential question: are we alone? NewsNation has confirmed David Grusch's credentials and resume. We have not seen or verified the alleged proof he says he's provided to investigators, but we want you to hear his story so you can decide for yourself. Mr. Grusch sat down with investigative journalist Ross Coulthart, who is reporting for NewsNation. Mr. Coulthart is an award-winning journalist and author who has reported for the Australian version of 60 Minutes, as well as other news programs in his home country. What you're about to see is part of their conversation, touching on Mr. Grusch's work with the UAP task force, his background, and his service to this country, and the alleged secret military program about which he says the world needs to know.

Narrator:
For decades, the UFO question has been consigned to the realm of

speculation, but in recent years, serious people have started taking the subject seriously. You'll see it come through the top of the screen there; it goes, prompted in part by the release of these videos purporting to show encounters between American naval aviators and what the Pentagon has labeled unidentified aerial or anomalous phenomena. Congress has convened hearings to determine what these UAP are and what threat they might pose. If UAP do indeed represent a potential threat to our security, then the capabilities, systems, processes, and sources we use to observe, record, study, or analyze these phenomena need to be classified at appropriate levels. The Department of Defense has established a special team, formerly known as the UAP task force, recently renamed the All...

[03:38 -> 07:19]

Interviewer:

The domain anomaly resolution office, or Arrow, is tasked with investigating and identifying what are now hundreds of reported sightings. So far, they have not confirmed any of them to constitute proof of alien life. Officially, the government continues to state that we are indeed alone. But now, for the first time, a former member of that official investigative team is speaking out, telling a stunning story that impacts every person on this planet. And now you're about to meet that man for the very first time in this exclusive television interview. Welcome.

David Grusch:

Maybe start off by telling me your name and who you are. My name is David Grusch. I came from a blue-collar family in Pittsburgh. I didn't have the money for college, but I always admired people in uniform and wanted to be part of something bigger than myself. Eighteen years ago, I received an Air Force scholarship for physics. I originally commissioned on active duty in the Air Force and served 14 years.

Interviewer:

I look at this photograph, Dave, and I see a very proud officer.

David Grusch:

I was getting promoted to captain when I was deployed.

Interviewer:

And you still love your country, don't you?

David Grusch:

Absolutely. As a career intelligence officer, I spent time on the ground in Afghanistan and other places I can't mention before rotating back to Washington. I was an Intel officer for the U.S. for 14 years. My last position, which I left in April of 2023, was co-leading the UAP portfolio for the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency. Some of the highest officials within the Department of Defense and the intelligence community used to call on me to advise them on some of the hardest target sets that the country had.

Interviewer:

You are one of the most trusted former intelligence officials in the

U.S. defense and intelligence establishment.

David Grusch:

Yes, I was.

Interviewer:

You were trusted with the most intimate secrets.

David Grusch:

Yes.

Interviewer:

And you say the most earth-shattering of those secrets were revealed after 2019 when you were invited to join the UAP task force.

David Grusch:

I had the security classifications to go anywhere and ask anyone anything. Based on my formal security clearance and multiple polygraphs, I had the ability to be read into any program that I needed. At one point in time, I was extremely highly cleared.

Interviewer:

What conclusion did you come to at the end of your time on the UAP task force?

David Grusch:

The UAP task force was refused access to a broad crash retrieval program.

Interviewer:

When you say crash retrieval, what do you mean?

David Grusch:

These are retrieving non-human origin technical vehicles. You could call them spacecraft, if you will—non-human exotic origin vehicles that have either landed or crashed.

Interviewer:

We have spacecraft from another species?

David Grusch:

We do, yes.

Interviewer:

How many?

David Grusch:

Quite a number.

Interviewer:

You're kidding.

David Grusch:

No, I thought it was totally nuts, and at first, I thought I was being

deceived. It was a ruse. People started confiding in me; they approached me. I have plenty of current and former senior intelligence officers who came to me, many of whom I knew almost my whole career, and they confided to me that they were part of a program. They named the program, and I had never heard of it. They told me based on the oral testimony...

[07:21 -> 08:10]

David Grusch:

They provided me documents and other proof that there was, in fact, a program that the UAP task force was not read into. You are alleging that the U.S. government has been concealing the existence of alien life on this planet. I would couch it as non-human intelligence, or NHI, as we like to say in our language. Why do you say that? I don't want to necessarily denote origin; I don't think we have all the data to say they are coming from a certain location. I couch it as someone who studied physics, where maybe they're coming from a different physical dimension, as described in quantum mechanics. We know there are extra dimensions due to high-energy particle collisions, etc., and there's a theoretical framework to explain that.

[08:10 -> 08:20]

Interviewer:

Just let me cut to the quick, though. You're saying there is an intelligent species engaging with this planet?

[08:20 -> 08:30]

David Grusch:

Yes, that's potentially extraterrestrial.

[08:30 -> 08:41]

Interviewer:

I speak for everybody sitting at home when I say that is a shock. It was to me, and I had a lot of sleepless nights.

[08:41 -> 09:02]

David Grusch:

I've never personally seen non-human intelligence, but I've spoken to enough people directly involved in what I call the program that I'm convinced it's real. I started out as a non-believer. I came to the problem as a hardcore physics guy and Intel officer, so I have a—excuse my language—factor. I was very methodical, interviewing people who didn't know each other, making sure this wasn't some kind of cover-up of some other program.

[09:02 -> 09:15]

David Grusch:

I pressed to gain direct access to this program, and that's when my trouble started. I claim my investigation was stymied; my requests for access were rebuffed. They shut the door in my face. They denied me access to these programs.

[09:15 -> 09:29]

David Grusch:

Soon after, I endured reprisals and retaliation from above. I then reported that information to the intelligence community Inspector General. That's why I filed this whistleblower complaint. I say that experience is why I decided to go public.

[09:29 -> 09:41]

Interviewer:

In a recent article written by Leslie Kane in The Debrief, you're not being paid for this interview?

[09:41 -> 09:43]

David Grusch:

No, I'm not.

[09:43 -> 10:03]

Interviewer:

Why are you doing this?

[10:03 -> 10:03]

David Grusch:

It's a sense of service. Call me a Boy Scout or whatever. When I saw the kind of wrongdoing, I didn't want to be 60 or 70 years old in the future and have that "coulda, shoulda, woulda" feeling where I could have made a difference. I did not want to live a life of regret.

[10:03 -> 10:19]

Interviewer:

You are saying to the human race for the first time that an official intelligence representative at a high level from the U.S. government is saying publicly we are not alone?

[10:19 -> 10:24]

David Grusch:

We're definitely not alone. Absolutely. The data points empirically that we're not alone.

[10:24 -> 10:33]

Interviewer:

You've said that the United States has spacecraft-intact craft?

[10:33 -> 10:37]

David Grusch:

We do.

[10:37 -> 10:49]

Interviewer:

Do we have bodies? Do we have species?

[10:49 -> 10:49]

David Grusch:

Well, naturally, when you recover something that's either landed or crashed, sometimes you encounter dead pilots. Believe it or not, as fantastical as that sounds.

[10:51 -> 14:41]

David Grusch:

It's true. I have seen some interesting photos and I've read some very interesting reports, but the specific documents and photos that would prove my claims are still classified, and I cannot disclose them here. Let's deal with the issue of your credibility. Why should we believe you? You're just somebody coming out of nowhere making claims that we ultimately can't prove.

Well, we provided the proof internally to the Inspector General and the Hill staff with all the details. I have the credentials; I was an intelligence officer on the UAP task force. But let's face it, allegations of aliens and spacecraft are hard to accept, even coming from a respected insider. Even if you call them NHI and UAP, how could such NHI travel to Earth in the first place and go undetected by the general public?

I say the craft may not be traveling through space as we understand it. It is a well-established fact, at least mathematically and based on empirical observation and analysis, that there are most likely additional physical spatial dimensions. You can imagine in four and five-dimensional space where what we experience as linear time ends up being a physical dimension in higher-dimensional space. If you were living there, you could translate across what we perceive as a linear flow.

So there is a possibility that, and this is a theory here—I'm not saying this is 100% the case—but it could be that this is not necessarily extraterrestrial and is actually coming from a higher-dimensional physical space that might be co-located right here.

What can you tell me about these craft and these technologies? Why do you know it's exotic? Based on the very specific properties that I was briefed on, you know, isotopic ratios that would have to be engineered for it to be at those levels, but also just extremely strange heavy atomic metals—high up in the periodic table—arrangements that we don't understand, you know, what the emergent properties are. There's just a very strange mix of elements.

So you're absolutely sure that the materials these crafts are made of are clearly not of this Earth?

Yes, they're sophisticatedly engineered, certainly not by humans. While I say the U.S. has gleaned some insight from these materials for military use, so much more could be done if academia and the private sector had access. It's totally nuts that humanity as a whole, especially the U.S. citizenry, is not benefiting from broad research on this to solve propulsion, energy issues, and novel material science that can improve people's quality of life. It's just totally nuts how it's been protected and inhibits progress.

If you're right, if you're telling us the truth, then everyone—the entire American public—has been lied to for decades.

Yes, there's a sophisticated disinformation campaign targeting the U.S. populace, which is extremely unethical and immoral.

How long has this been going on?

A lot of the things I was briefed on were very shocking.

[14:44 -> 18:35]

Interviewer:

Let's start from the very beginning. You say it's a 90-year cover-up.

David Grusch:

Just about, yeah. Ninety years. The first recovery in Europe was in 1933 in Magenta, Italy. They recovered a partially intact vehicle. It's long been known that the regime of dictator Benito Mussolini documented numerous UAPs during this time. This internal memo from the Italian secret services includes crude drawings of the UAPs. It's true; it's real. That actually happened. The Italian government moved it to a secure air base in Italy for the rest of the fascist regime until 1944 or 1945. You know, Pope Pius XII backchanneled that, so the Vatican was involved and told the Americans what the Italians had, and we ended up scooping it.

Interviewer:

So let me be very clear about this: you're saying that the Catholic Church, the Vatican, knows about the existence of non-human intelligence on this planet?

David Grusch:

Certainly. Shortly after the dawn of the atomic age, another major crash recovery took place. You've probably heard of it. What can you tell me about the Roswell craft?

David Grusch:

Fortunately, those details were not approved for me to talk about right now. This much we know: in 1947, an object crashed in the New Mexico desert near the town of Roswell. The Air Force recovered material described as metallic and rubbery, though the government changed its story as to what it was, calling it a flying disc at first, then a weather or spy balloon. It just seemed ridiculous to me that the U.S. Air Force had changed its story. They added additional elements over time and tried to conflate additional programs to explain some of the events. Why are these things crashing? You know, some are landed, some are crashed, and I think that's an interesting discussion that has come up. As advanced as we are as humans, planes crash, cars crash. Just because you're some advanced sentience that has advanced technology doesn't mean some small percentage of your—I'll use the Air Force term—sorties meet an unfortunate operational conclusion, as we might want to say.

Interviewer:

Most people would tell you the Roswell incident has been thoroughly debunked. In fact, the Air Force published this report in 1994 to put

the issue to rest once and for all.

David Grusch:

I've read that report. That analysis they did was a total hack job. Even anyone with analytical skills, if you read it, you can deduce that they're conflating multiple situations with crash test dummies and then Mogul balloons. They're just saying that the townsfolk who personally witnessed it were totally imagining things. They concocted that whole report just to disinform.

Interviewer:

So the reason for the secrecy is what?

David Grusch:

Exactly. It's about feudalistic dominance. Who can have both asymmetric technology? It seems like just fueling the war machine. Through the 50s and 60s, encounters with the NHI continued, as did the cover-up. One incident in 1967, about which multiple Air Force veterans have gone public, involved UAPs tampering with the nuclear missiles at Malmstrom Air Base.

[18:38 -> 22:36]

David Grusch:

In Montana, they saw a craft that appeared to be intelligently controlled, hovering over a nuclear weapons silo and shutting down ten nuclear ICBM missiles. It certainly looks like they want to understand how far we've advanced in our nuclear fissile technologies, at the very least. I mean, it looks like preparatory probing activity. It might be innocent scientific gathering, or it could be ISR probing.

Meanwhile, the crash retrieval program continued, and while I won't reveal where the downed crafts are stored, I can say that the people working with the technology have been putting themselves at risk. Many of them were injured while examining some of this material. You can imagine the nuclear, radiological, and biological risks involved in looking at the unknown. A lot of them have literally suffered physically because of their service.

But as we know, anyone who has come forward claiming that non-human intelligence is behind these incidents has been dismissed as delusional or deliberately deceitful. If you're right, if you're telling us the truth, then the entire American public has been lied to for decades. There is a sophisticated disinformation campaign targeting the U.S. populace, which is extremely unethical and immoral.

Coming up, we have new evidence and perhaps new attitudes in a new age of UAPs. The American people need and deserve to know more. Has the U.S. government changed its tune?

[Music]

[Applause]

[Music]

These are the videos that started it all—footage captured by Naval aviators on military-grade cameras that defied all prosaic explanations. I have investigated this one shot in 2015 off the east coast by fighter pilots from the USS Theodore Roosevelt. There is an industry of debunkers out there on the web who say, "Oh, they've got this all wrong; it's a jet exhaust at a distance, and the aircraft's turning."

I had some optical engineering experts look at that, and based on the pixel saturation and apparent size from the Raytheon 80 FLIR system, it's certainly something that's not a jet. It might be some kind of natural phenomenon—it's quite strange—but it's not as simple as a jet.

I have even stronger opinions about this UAP, now known in history as the Tic Tac, shot in 2004 in the Pacific by aviators off the USS Nimitz. The Tic Tac is truly anomalous—absolutely a technical vehicle, physical, and that's something we didn't make. Most likely, it's not of this world.

The videos were leaked in 2017 and then officially released by the Pentagon in 2020. At the time, it seemed the Pentagon may have finally abandoned its obsession with secrecy and decided to do what other countries have been doing for decades: establish a properly funded, publicly accountable team to investigate reports of UAPs.

I was part of that team. This is a hunt mission for what might be happening in our backyard that we don't know about. The task force set about investigating these incidents, including more recent events like the odd encounters that took place during naval exercises in 2019 off the coast of San Diego. This video was shot on the USS Omaha and later leaked to a documentarian.

[22:40 -> 26:10]

Interviewer:

Jeremy Corbell has received particular attention. It either zooms off so fast you can't see it, or it sinks into the ocean, but it seems to drop. What do you know about it?

David Grusch:

It was truly anomalous. But I say the promised new age of government transparency is a fallacy. For starters, the videos that have been released are just the tip of the iceberg. There are many videos that are totally fair to release through a declassification process, and I find it very concerning from a transparency perspective that all the Department has declassified were those three famous videos. There are more concerning videos that left me with a lot of questions.

He says there are credible witnesses who could testify to Congress about spacecraft—big spacecraft. A lot of them were very large, very large, yeah, like a football field kind of size. I remember interviewing these personnel, and I'm like, even if these people are lying to me, they're having a psychotic break, or this is some crazy but true stuff that's happening. I have no good explanation that's

prosaic at all for this because this is not explainable by, you know, swamp gas, St. Elmo's Fire, or ball lightning, etc. I mean, this is like tangible technical craft they're seeing up close and personal in some cases.

At the center of it all is the crash retrieval program, which the government has never publicly acknowledged. This program, Grusch says, includes at least one private aerospace company that is storing alien craft.

Interviewer:
Is that true?

David Grusch:
That is how a lot of these relationships are. While I don't want to name the specific companies and government elements, overall, the government has been the custodian of a lot of this, right? They'll hand it out to a clear defense contractor to do some analysis, which I find highly unethical. You have basically a sole-source arrangement, and you allow certain private corporate elements to look at this, develop potential insights, and then sell it back to the government for profit. I think that's totally unethical.

The problem you've got is there have been categorical denials from high-level officials in the U.S. government, even presidents, that what you're saying is true. Unfortunately, some elected officials were not brought in. Only a few weeks ago, on the 19th of April, the head of the Pentagon's UAP investigations program, Dr. Sean Kirkpatrick, told Congress that Arrow—that's the Pentagon's UFO investigation body—has found no credible evidence thus far of extraterrestrial activity, off-world technology, or objects that defy the known laws of physics. While a large number of cases in our holdings remain technically unresolved, this is primarily due to a lack of data associated with those cases.

Interviewer:
was that a lie?

David Grusch:
Well, I know Dr. Sean Kirkpatrick; I've known him for about eight years. I expressed some concerns to Dr. Kirkpatrick about a year ago and told him what I was starting to uncover, and he didn't follow up with me. He has my phone number; he could have called me. I hope he ultimately does the right thing. He should be able to make the same.

[26:14 -> 29:57]

David Grusch:
Investigative discoveries I did, it's totally crazy. The implication here is that the head of the very body that Congress has ordered to tell the American public the truth about UAPs is possibly misleading the American public. Do you think the American public is being lied to? Well, they've been lied to over the years, and I'm hoping that the lies stop.

It gets even scarier. The UFO whistleblower says the NHI aren't all friendly. Have human beings been hurt or killed by a non-human intelligence? And guess who they might be working with? We're in a competition with their adversaries to understand this, and it's a multi-decade cold war that has been under our nose for so long.

The common interpretation from some commentators is that there is a non-human species that is incredibly benevolent towards the human race. I think that the logical fallacy there is that because they're advanced, they're kind. We will never really understand their full intent because we're not them, whatever "them" is or are.

But I think what appears to be malevolent activity has happened based on not only nuclear site probing activities but also witness testimony. If we look at it through a humanistic lens, it does appear negative, at least to us. I've been told that there have been attempts to bring down craft, but we've acted offensively against non-human craft. There have been instances where human beings have been hurt or killed by a non-human intelligence.

While I can't get into the specifics because that would reveal certain U.S. classified operations, I was briefed by a few individuals on the program that there were malevolent events like that. Now I'm scared people have just heard you say non-humans may well have murdered human beings. That seems to be the case at one point.

Yeah, and there's more. Grusch says the United States is not the only country that's encountered NHI and their technology. He says our geopolitical rivals have their own crash retrieval programs, which they are also secretly exploiting for military purposes. We're in a competition with their adversaries to understand this, and it's a multi-decade cold war that has been under our nose for so long.

You know, there is no good way to level the playing field and hold other nation-states accountable if they're engaging in unethical or illicit activity as it relates to the subject. I think the obtuse secrecy is actually putting us in a very dangerous position where a country might make a breakthrough—let's say it's an adversary of ours—and it is so destabilizing. You say there's been a cold war behind the scenes with Russia and China. There has been a cold war with our pure adversaries.

[30:00 -> 31:27]

Interviewer:

Why hasn't Russia or China come out and spoken publicly about this? I think they're in a similar predicament as us, where they understand some of the socioeconomic destabilization factors in their own society. But if this non-human intelligence is so advanced, and at least some of them are malevolent, why haven't they destroyed us already? Perhaps some fragile yet combustible détente has been reached. Grusch has written an internal document about his discoveries that refers to agreements that risk putting our future in jeopardy. It's quite clear that you're talking about agreements between America and non-human intelligences. Have we made agreements with non-human

intelligences?

David Grusch:

That's the kind of information I really hope national leadership is able to get to the bottom of. I need to pin you down on this: are there agreements between non-human intelligences and the American government?

Interviewer:

I think that's a question that I would like to know all the details of as well. We do know of at least one agreement among humans that's worth noting: this 1971 agreement between the U.S. and the USSR on measures to reduce the risk of nuclear war. Whether or not you believe Dave Grusch, this document proves the two superpowers were aware that UAP existed.

[31:32 -> 33:01]

David Grusch:

If you look at Article 3 of that treaty, it discusses unidentified objects near nuclear facilities that are interfering with communications. This treaty has been used, from what I understand, to notify each other if there's a concerning event. It's a way of saying to the Russians, "Hey, don't shoot at us; it's not us." That's certainly a concern because of the secrecy involved. There is an environment where you could have almost a false flag situation, where a true non-preserved UAP situation could be contrived as a provocation from a nation-state. We want to de-escalate that if true. If the stakes are so high, if the fate of the human race is at stake, perhaps it's no surprise to hear that the U.S. government will do anything to keep these secrets safe. Can I put it to you that crimes must have been committed? At the very least, I saw substantive evidence that white-collar crime was committed. Have people been killed to protect the secret? Based on the people I've talked to, that was an ongoing concern. Unfortunately, I've heard some really un-American things that I don't want to repeat right now. So, you have a strong suspicion that people have been murdered to protect these secrets over the years?

[33:04 -> 34:35]

Interviewer:

You're deluding yourself. It's time to put our whistleblowers' credibility to the test. Everybody watching this right now is looking at your face and asking, "Is this guy for real?"

[33:19]

[Music]

[33:22]

[Applause]

[33:25]

[Music]

[33:28]

Let's talk about what David Grusch doesn't have. He doesn't have

smoking gun documents or photos. He doesn't have official confirmation of his claims. He's just a guy talking on camera, and a lot of his answers to our most pointed questions sound like this:

[33:43]

Can you comment?

[33:45]

Unfortunately, I cannot.

[33:49]

So who is this guy really?

[33:52]

David Grusch:

I don't want fame or fortune. I'm just here to provide public leadership on an issue that I uncovered, and I thought it was totally outrageous.

[33:59]

Interviewer:

NewsNation has confirmed through multiple sources that David Grusch is who he says he is: an Air Force veteran from Pittsburgh who worked in military intelligence and was part of the UAP task force. Maybe he's just a confident, well-spoken ex-military intelligence officer who just happens to have lost his mind. Do you have any kind of mental illness?

[34:22]

David Grusch:

No.

[34:25]

Interviewer:

Have you ever had a psychosis? Is there anything in your medical history that might be capable of being interpreted as a reason why you might be confabulating or making things up?

[34:30]

David Grusch:

No, I'm not a...

[34:38 -> 35:59]

David Grusch:

I resigned on my own accord because I thought, altruistically, it's more appropriate to show thought leadership on the outside on this now. I hit an impasse within the government trying to right this wrong, so I have to be blunt about this: you're not making this up; this is not a lie.

Interviewer:

No, absolutely not.

David Grusch:

Because everybody watching this right now is looking at your face and they're going, "Is this guy for real?"

Interviewer:

I am for real, and I'm sitting here at great personal risk and obvious professional risk by talking to you today.

Interviewer:

You've told us that we really are not alone. Even though you believe what you say is true, you haven't been fed disinformation. It's a common thing in intelligence for governments to mislead.

David Grusch:

Yeah, I was very sensitive to that fact. You know, was this some kind of ruse against me? Am I being used in any kind of way? I took about four years being very methodical before I filed my whistleblower complaint to be absolutely certain of these basic facts.

Interviewer:

So take me through the process of how you convinced yourself that this is real.

David Grusch:

well, based on the credentialed people that came to me, some of these subjects provided me sensitive foreign intelligence to read.

[36:01 -> 37:28]

David Grusch:

I reviewed program documents and photographs to evaluate, and then I described in very specific detail how all this worked. They were telling me that the exact, extremely specific details all checked out. The other thing I have trouble with is the fact that, in my experience as a journalist, it's very hard for governments to keep secrets. Most things leak; your government leaks like a sieve. So, why hasn't this leaked? Well, I've certainly been the recipient of a lot of U.S. government secrets, and I can tell you they've never seen the light of day, that's for sure. I guess ostensibly this has been like a sieve for decades, but it was a very sophisticated disinformation campaign where they have allowed some of the truth to come out through some of their tradecraft. However, they've disenfranchised people; they've stigmatized it. They made it a total wacky thing to talk about, so anybody who may come forward with that kind of information is looked at like a total tinfoil hat guy. It's a perfect amalgamation of disinformation to just make it look crazy. The best reason to believe me may be this document. Remember that whistleblower complaint I filed? It would seem it hasn't fallen on deaf ears, so the Inspector General of the...

[37:29 -> 38:55]

David Grusch:

The intelligence services of the United States have the information you've got.

Yes. More importantly, the Inspector General made a determination

about the credibility of your complaint. They found, after interviewing myself and other subjects—some of whom I am not even cognizant of—they found my complaint to be urgent and credible for the intelligence committees. The word "credible" is important, and I appreciate that. So, an official investigatory body of the United States government has determined that your allegations are credible, correct?

Coming up in true... then what are we going to do if the biggest secret on the planet is now out in the open? what are they going to do? How will the non-human intelligence react?

[Music]
[Applause]

Thank you. This is one of the gravest constitutional crises for your country ever.

Absolutely. Give me some hope here. There are good people—there are very good people—and I want that message to be crystal clear. Let's not demonize the U.S. government as a whole. There is a whole army of people that want change. I am one of tens, if not hundreds, of individuals within...

[38:58 -> 40:33]

Interviewer:

The government has programs that would like a change. what kind of change does David Grusch want? As he stated here tonight, he wants the NHI technology to be shared so the rest of the world can benefit from it.

He uses nuclear weapons or nuclear physics as an example of an acknowledged program. We have nuclear weapons, but you don't get to know the designs. However, nuclear physics holistically is unclassified; academia studies it. why would you suppress basic astrophysics, astrobiology, or other hard and soft sciences broadly? It's totally nonsensical.

Grusch has left the government; he wasn't part of Arrow during the most recent Congressional hearings when even more UAPs were revealed, including one captured by a drone in the Middle East in 2022. His whistleblower case will take months to conclude. In the meantime, he says he's starting a scientific foundation and is willing to speak to anyone in Washington who has the clearance and the desire to hear the classified information he could not share here.

He stated, "I make myself available to Secretary Austin and DNI Haynes, who are recipients of my complaints. I'm happy to further brief elected officials on the specific ecosystem of secrecy down to the fine details, whoever they are."

How will the non-human intelligence react to the revelation that human beings now know?

[40:34 -> 41:52]

David Grusch:

They're here. I mean, obviously, the non-human intelligences have been around for a while, at least multiple decades in modern history. They've allowed us to annihilate ourselves—genocide, war, famine, etc. So, at the very least, I think they're kind of neutral on what humans decide to do with their free will.

As for how we, the human race, will react to this story, I think it evokes that quintessentially human characteristic of optimism. I don't have this utopian ideology that this is going to solve real problems or stop war entirely, but all I want is a moment of pause to see if the subject unites us. We've obviously become more divided over the last couple of decades.

If anything else, what you're revealing may mean we all start thinking of ourselves not as American, Australian, Russian, or Chinese, but as part of the human family. I think that's totally the right term.

Thank you for watching. Go to [newsnationnow.com](https://www.newsnationnow.com) to find NewsNation on your television provider, and don't forget to click the red subscribe button below to get more of NewsNation's fact-driven, unbiased coverage.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2a2iNW5AZjw>

[00:01 -> 02:53]

Roberto Pinotti:

So, Dave, nowadays you are very famous in the whole UFO community. But let's go back a bit and please tell us the basic reasons that made you decide to come forward with your exclusive declarations.

David Grusch:

Well, the journey of going public was a very long one. It was a journey that I didn't think would end the way it did, with me leaving my career. I reported that information to the Inspector General back in 2022 because I saw the UAP Task Force was not being afforded access to these programs that I uncovered through witness interviews, document reviews, etc. Based on the reprisals I was facing, it was most prudent for me, for my own protection, to submit a whistleblower complaint with the Intelligence Community Inspector General. That ran its course, and I provided the Intelligence Committee's information in late 2022. However, I saw the writing on the wall where I wasn't going to be able to affect change and pressure the investigation that would have been necessary to break open these programs for further study within the government.

So, I took it upon myself. I looked around, and I was the only one out of my small contingent of colleagues that had the right opportunity to go public. I decided that made the most sense so I could use the levers of public pressure to hold the legislative and executive branches accountable in the U.S. I saw internally that there was no way this issue was going to be self-policed within the U.S. government, so I needed to go outside to hold them accountable.

Roberto Pinotti:

Good. Specifically, I would like to know, did you experience any kind of problems for what you have publicly declared?

David Grusch:

There were some high-level officials in some former agencies I worked for who were very unhappy to see my face on television. Some of the pushback I received after I went public is that I have told Congress that behind closed doors and the Department of Defense Inspector...

[02:55 -> 05:25]

Roberto Pinotti:

General, are you looking at some of the reprisal aspects after you went public? There are some things that Congress may disclose in the future about certain elements of the US government that were unhappy with you going public. Could you tell us, Dave, as far as you are told and as far as you can, how many UFO or UAP crafts are in possession of the US government?

David Grusch:

I was presented with those specific numbers in a classified environment, and I did provide those metrics to authorities. As I said on News Nation, it is quite a number. I'll just say it's in double digits. The exact numbers I did not clear through pre-publication and

security review. Furthermore, some of the specifics, as I've mentioned in a recent interview on a YouTube channel called Yes Theory, really should be disclosed by the US president and other officials because I don't have all the data. I don't know what some of the ramifications are with certain things.

You have to remember that giving out specific metrics or numbers to foreign intelligence services Russia, China, etc. they're watching this video right now, and they want to see if they got their numbers right. I'm not here to provide foreign intelligence services with additional data, so I have to be very careful about specifics. It's not because I don't want to be transparent, but I do know foreign intelligence services are monitoring these kinds of videos.

Roberto Pinotti:

Dave, could you tell us something about the involvement of private US corporations in the reverse engineering programs?

David Grusch:

Yes, there have certainly been private corporations involved, both federally funded research and development centers and for-profit companies that have contracted with the US government over the years. As I mentioned in other interviews, the US government overlay the Manhattan Project secrecy personnel. Generally, what elements were involved corporately and governmentally in that, too, includes the Atomic Energy Commission, which later morphed into the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. That is why you see the Schumer amendment in the United States.

[05:27 -> 08:09]

David Grusch:

I hope that it will be signed here very shortly, and maybe it will be signed by the time the conference happens. They cite the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and other provisions within the unclassified Schumer Amendment. This is because they understand that the secrecy justification ran along the lines of U.S. nuclear secrets, and that's a whole other discussion for now. You'll notice in the Schumer Amendment they talk about transclassified foreign nuclear information, or TFN, and that is not by accident. You can imagine what that means: if the U.S., through intelligence operations, stole a foreign nuclear secret, the U.S. would want to make that foreign nuclear secret their own. So, they transclassified it into a U.S. protected nuclear capability. That's what the Schumer Amendment is trying to expose if you read between the lines. They've justified it through these nuclear secrecy provisions.

Yes, certainly private companies were involved. The specific ones I provided to the congressional committees and the Inspector General, down to specific facilities. I am aware of the addresses where they exist, and I had individuals who firsthand worked on the program provide that disclosure and interview with the Inspector General as well. So, it wasn't just coming from me.

Are you aware or can you confirm the fact that murders have been

committed for the purpose of maintaining secrecy regarding everything concerning the UFO and UAP subject? I don't have any personal knowledge, but of the 40 people we interviewed, I'd say about 10 to 12 of them had concerns about wet work murders in the past, people going missing in their workplace. I certainly had some disturbing things happen to me in my personal life from a physical intimidation perspective, which I reported to my agency's Counterintelligence element when I was still in government. Obviously, I was never physically harmed, but I certainly saw signatures of what I thought was...

[08:12 -> 10:46]

David Grusch:

Illicit extra-governmental activity related to intimidating me and some of my other colleagues was very disturbing and upsetting information. I don't have any personal knowledge of that kind of stuff, but I did talk to firsthand witnesses who had very high credentials as government officials, and they did express concerns about illicit work and other forms of physical intimidation. I don't believe they were lying, so I feel that this is a genuine concern, and I would champion an investigation to see if that is true.

In 1971, when I was a lieutenant in the Italian Army serving in an elite NATO unit with atomic missiles in Northern Italy, I was asked by two United States Army officers if I was aware that the United States had recovered crashed UFOs and the bodies of their pilots.

In any case, can you confirm that the same kind of declarations you publicly provided have been made in classified environments by other military or intelligence officers?

Yes, those same facts were confirmed to me by people with firsthand knowledge who worked on those programs. There have been crashes, and we have retrieved craft and biological material bodies, if you will as I've stated previously in public.

Can you provide at least an estimate of how many whistleblowers have come forward?

I believe there was a news article recently that discussed around 28 or 30 whistleblowers who came forward to the All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office (AARO). Of course, I'm not involved in that part, but those are the numbers I saw in the news article. In terms of how many have come to the Intelligence Community Inspector General, I'd say about a dozen or so. Some of the whistleblowers I don't personally know, so I can't identify who else may have come forward to back up their claims or file independent complaints. It's certainly not just me; I was the one who took it for the team and went public, but there are at least a dozen or so people behind the scenes like me.

[10:50 -> 13:40]

David Grusch:

There were individuals who actually worked on the program firsthand, who touched the craft, if you will. So, you can indirectly confirm at

least part of what the late Colonel Philip Corso wrote in his book, *The Day After Roswell*, concerning the reverse engineering operations being conducted by private corporations with materials provided by the military. Yes, at least to some extent. I mean, I can't verify his whole story, of course. I think he died in 1998, and I was only 11 or 12 years old then. However, certainly, the U.S. government, if they had custodianship, would provide some pieces and parts to different private contractors for reverse engineering. At least that general story is true. As for the other aspects of his story and whether he was specifically involved, I'm not certain. I was never able to interview him or investigate this matter within the scope of my duties, but generally, that statement holds true.

What about the biological aspect? How many bodies were recovered, as far as you were told? Were only dead bodies recovered, or were there also living biological entities? Certainly, the numbers are significant, similar to crash retrievals. I would leave it at double digits. The biologics came in a variety of states and morphologies, but that's the stuff I can't quite get into publicly. I encourage the president and others to explain the types of biological recoveries we've had. I urge the executive branch in our country to inform the world about this, as we have been hearing stories of secret U.S. government extraterrestrial contacts and even treaties struck for decades.

In 2020, the prominent Israeli scientist Haim Eshed also openly confirmed this scenario. Are you by any chance aware of this? If possible, can you tell us something on this subject? I didn't interview anyone who exposed firsthand knowledge about any kind of active communication or interaction with non-human intelligence. Many believe that there was probably an aspect of the program that dealt with that; however, I...

[13:42 -> 16:25]

David Grusch:

I was not able to interview anybody that had firsthand knowledge, so anything I would say would be rumor and speculation. However, I think that is an extremely fair question to ask, and it's a question I would like an answer to as well because I was never able to interview anybody that had that firsthand knowledge, definitely to make me confident to say anything with any authority.

Now, coming to the subject that has raised quite a bit of interest here in Italy, that is the so-called Mussolini UFO case, which was also confirmed by Luis Elizondo. Could you please elaborate on how you came to know about the event, its characteristics, and...

Yes, some of my interview subjects that I ultimately directed to the Inspector General did give me a briefing on all the U.S. involved recoveries that happened over the years. The Mussolini case, interestingly enough, is already out there in public vernacular thanks to your work uncovering that case. The 1933 Magenta area crash was one of the events they talked about, and that was one that I submitted in my DOD and pre-publication review to be able to talk about publicly

because I thought it was a very remarkable international case that would hopefully spur not just U.S. interests but European interests as well.

What's interesting about that crash this is some information I haven't stated publicly, but I did submit it for security review when they went to recover it, it had an acorn or bell shape. However, what really happened there is they believe that the original craft was lenticular or saucer-shaped because when it crashed, all the edges were broken off around the craft. So it looked like a bell or an acorn, but really it had additional characteristics that were destroyed when it landed.

Pope Pius XII was involved, and he sent a communication through the OSS, the American Office of Strategic Services, which ended up going to FDR's desk. As far as I know, unless the records were destroyed, the Vatican and the section of the Vatican secret archives related to Pope Pius XII should have documented evidence from what I...

[16:28 -> 19:14]

David Grusch:

I was told by the Intel officers who briefed me, those with firsthand knowledge, that they assumed the Vatican still had those records and that they weren't destroyed. They speculated that if they did exist, it would have been in the specific records of the Pope, particularly due to the involvement of P-12 back then. Ultimately, that information was recovered at the end of the war and came under U.S. possession afterward.

Just out of curiosity, you have served in the United States Air Force, so this can be your opinion. Since the object crashed in Italy and was rather large, do you think it could have been transported to the United States by airplane or via a ship?

I don't recall them ever mentioning how it was brought back, but if I were to speculate based on my knowledge of B-29, B-17, and C-47 aircraft from that time, considering the dimensions they described to me, it was fairly large over 10 meters. Therefore, I think it would have had to be transported by ship. It sounded too big for any U.S. transport plane that I'm aware of from World War II. That would be my pure speculation, but I don't actually know how they did it.

So, Dave, can you confirm whether or not bodies were recovered from the 1933 Magenta UFO crash?

I did ask that question to my briefers, and the answer was no. They don't recall any biological material coming with it; it was just an artifact that they recovered. So, I'm not aware of any bodies, and they were not aware of any either.

David, finally, are you aware of the existence of other original documents, whether of Italian, American, or German origin, connected to the Italian 1933 UFO crash?

I would surmise that there are probably records in the FDR classified presidential records in America, but that was research I was never able to conduct myself. Besides that, I'm not aware of any other documentation, aside from internal U.S. legacy crash retrieval documents and other materials that some of my interview subjects had personal access to in their U.S. government duties. Now, there were other foreign...

[19:21 -> 21:47]

Roberto Pinotti:

Events that they actually provided the intelligence reports to me, and I personally read the reports myself and laid eyes on those documents. However, those are different events not in Western Europe. So, Dave, this is going to be the final question of this interview. Could you elaborate on the international dimension of this UFO retrieval and reverse engineering programs that have occurred in other countries, as far as you can tell?

David Grusch:

Yes, this is an extension of what I mentioned in my initial News Nation interview about that Cold War, that arms race that has been happening behind the scenes, below the noise floor. Certainly, our adversaries have their own programs, and we have been competing with them to gather all this information and, in turn, try to achieve engineering breakthroughs that provide advancements for weapons development for war purposes. Very little of this technology has matriculated into civil society. Our adversaries certainly have their own programs. For example, China announced that they have their own UAP task force. There was a June 2021 article in the South China Morning Post where China discussed using artificial intelligence and machine learning to evaluate UAP cases.

As for Russia, they haven't made a public statement in that regard that I can think of. They certainly made some statements in the 1990s, which you are very familiar with. However, as of late, I think China is the only one to make an official acknowledgment that they have a task force, although not necessarily anything else. With our adversaries, we have been engaged in these activities for a long time.

Roberto Pinotti:

Okay, gentlemen, so we are finished. Thank you very much.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R8TqBrrqL4U&t=3s>

Joe Rogan Experience #2065 - David Grusch

[00:01 -> 03:45]

Joe Rogan:

Check it out, The Joe Rogan Experience. Train by day, Joe Rogan podcast by night. All day, what's up? How are you, man?

David Grusch:

Hey, good. Good, thanks for coming here. I appreciate it.

Joe Rogan:

Yeah, yeah, no, it's a pleasure. You've been on a whirlwind sort of tour. I guess we should start from the beginning. So first of all, lay out for people what your job was with the military and how this all started for you.

David Grusch:

Yeah, yeah, so I was an intelligence officer in the Air Force for 14 years—seven active, seven reserve. Then I kind of had a parallel track in the civilian intelligence world when I became a reservist. Ultimately, I got brought back in civil service in a government role at the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency a couple of years ago at a senior level. I was a major in the Air Force and a GS-15 at NGA, which is like a full bird colonel equivalent for a civilian employee. You know, I'm very humbled that I was able to get that kind of job. But my career—mostly, I didn't even really think about this topic. UFOs were not on my radar; I wasn't really a believer. I was agnostic about it. Most of my career, I did a lot of behind-the-door special access program technical activities. I was kind of a space intelligence expert and a cyber intelligence expert.

Like I said, this was not on my radar at all. You know, I would joke with my buddies because I used to handle the Presidential Daily Brief for the National Reconnaissance Office director in my military capacity as a reservist. I was well cleared to hundreds and hundreds of compartmented programs, and you know, the joke was like, "When are we going to get the read-on for the crazy stuff?" And that never happened.

I do remember the day that I really can recall thinking, "Huh, what's with this UFO stuff?" I was briefing a senior person at the CIA into a couple of hundred special access programs. I was at the headquarters at the agency, and you know, after the indoctrination I was giving to the senior person, this individual—who worked with Lou Elizondo previously—was like, "Yeah, Dave, have you ever heard of this guy Lou Elizondo? He's running some UFO program at the Pentagon. We all think he's crazy." And I'm like, "I don't know who this guy Lou Elizondo is, and I don't know of any kind of UFO program, so that sounds nuts to me."

But lo and behold, that was like early 2017, and in December 2017, that New York Times article came out naming the AATIP program and the ASAPP program—so Advanced Aerospace Weapon Systems Application Program and the Advanced Aerospace Threat Identification Program being the

other acronym. I was like, "Holy crap, wait, that's that guy Lou Elizondo that I heard about!" You know, I think I have heard of ASAPP. When I was a lieutenant, I used to read these reports from the Defense Intelligence Agency on black holes and stuff, and I was like, "Oh, that's stupid. Why is the DIA looking into black holes and time warps?" It just didn't make any sense to me back in like '08 or '09 when I was a lieutenant.

And all of a sudden, I'm like, "Well, maybe there's something to this UFO thing." I'm not saying I was a believer either way on the subject, but this was a topic of concern apparently for the Pentagon. In 2018, I started doing kind of my...

[03:47 -> 07:34]

David Grusch:

I call my open source literature review, like, let me spin myself up on this topic. I was watching Chris Mellon, Luis Elizondo, Leslie Kean, all these people talk about the subject, and then, you know, just trying to understand, so what is this with UFOs? Has this been going on for a while? The answer is yes. There have been sightings of weird stuff throughout history, which we can get into later.

So, early 2019 comes along, and my boss at the National Reconnaissance Office, in my capacity as an Air Force Major, forwarded me an email from what became the Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force, or UAP Task Force, which was established in 2018. The UAP Task Force director sent my boss an email saying, "Hey, we're looking for a representative to the task force." As any good officer would, I thought, well, I'll put it on my performance report—hey, I was on a task force, and that would look good. I had been well cleared and also had a bachelor's degree in physics and a master's in intelligence analysis. I thought, you know what, I'll figure out what this is. It's either going to be weather phenomena, maybe it's an adversary program, or perhaps it's a U.S. program that people are misidentifying on rare occasions.

So, I decided to see where the data takes me. In early 2019, I joined the UAP Task Force, and then I started interviewing pilots and flag officers—General Officer equivalent type Navy folks. They were seeing some really crazy things. There was one incident I talked about previously in a YouTube video on the Yes Theory Channel. There was this one 30-year senior Navy officer who was going to work, sober, with no predisposition for fantasy. I interviewed him for a couple of hours, and he described seeing this crazy triangle hover over his car while he was driving to a certain Naval facility. It blew his mind; he was serious.

The paint on his car turned milky white after the incident. To me, that sounds like ionizing radiation, like ultraviolet light—just like how your headlights get all foggy over time if you park your car out in the sun. The same phenomenon happened within a 24-hour period. I thought, whoa, if this is true, and considering the oral testimony and the crazy radar data I saw while on the task force—stuff making turns that didn't make any sense—then, holy cow, what is this?

Is this anomaly with his paint documented? Are there photographs? Yes, I saw photographs; it was documented. Is there a conventional explanation? Based on what he described, something would have to rapidly ionize his paint like that within a day. I can't think of anything off the top of my head in terms of conventional aerospace technology. This incident occurred at a facility in the continental U.S., not overseas, so it's not like our adversaries were flying some spooky thing in U.S. airspace.

This thing hovered over his car for a couple of minutes while he was traveling at about 60 miles an hour. It was pacing him, probably a couple hundred feet in altitude, less than 1,000 feet, which is also concerning because, from an airspace perspective, pilots would know that anything under 1,000 feet requires special clearance.

[07:36 -> 11:06]

Joe Rogan:

You only do that over controlled airspace, like military test ranges, right? People fly low and that kind of thing. So, is he on a conventional civilian highway?

David Grusch:

Yes, a civilian highway. So anyone could have been on it. It just happened to be this guy.

Joe Rogan:

Did he have any other experiences with this thing?

David Grusch:

No, this was like a once-in-a-lifetime thing. He kept it to himself for a couple of years, but then he... um, what was his name? I don't know if that individual is still around. I'll call him Bob. But did anybody say to him, "Hey Bob, what the heck happened to your car?"

Joe Rogan:

That's a good question. I don't remember if people asked him about his car. He took pride in his car, so it was probably more upsetting to him personally. What kind of car was it?

David Grusch:

It was like a Toyota or something.

Joe Rogan:

Okay, so all of a sudden, it's a Toyota... okay. Did he have to report this?

David Grusch:

To my knowledge, he did not report it to anybody. It wasn't until he reported it to us about five years later that it happened.

Joe Rogan:

Are these kinds of experiences something that a lot of these pilots are embarrassed about discussing or have apprehension about discussing because they could be ridiculed?

David Grusch:

Yeah, a lot of people that are on flight status don't want to be sent to the psych. You know, there's a whole aerospace physiology kind of empire in the military. If you're an operator or a missile key-turner, you're on what's called the personal reliability program. If you're taking, like, Tylenol, you have to report it. If you have a fever, you have to report it because you're in control of nuclear weapons when you're on duty.

Joe Rogan:
Right.

David Grusch:

So, this idea of being predisposed to fantasy is also something that they sort of talk to these people about or try to gauge.

Joe Rogan:
Yeah.

David Grusch:

These are people that are very sober-minded. I mean, this individual was early in the morning going to work, not under the influence of anything. That person had a similar clearance as mine, you know, TS/SCI. We've both gone through top-secret Department of Information clearance, and just like myself, he had been through multiple polygraphs in his career.

Joe Rogan:
So, does he have any idea or any theories about why this thing was following him?

David Grusch:

No, that's what freaked him out the most because he didn't have any experience in his life like this. It totally blew his mind when he looked out his moonroof and then looked out the side of his car door and saw this 300-foot triangle. It was like the pre-dawn sky, but it was darker than the pre-dawn sky, and it had these plasma edges that were like purplish glowing edges. There were these three lights that had omnidirectional qualities, almost like pool lights—you know how you can't really tell where the light source is? It was totally trippy.

Joe Rogan:
WOW.

David Grusch:

And that's just one example of many anecdotal stories with some evidence from pilots. That's what made me dig deeper, and I started cultivating my network. I wondered if the government had studied this before. This wasn't just ASAP, AATIP, and Blue Book and all this stuff in the past, right? This seems serious. So, I thought, certainly the government has looked at this, and I went to search for that program, and that's what I ended up whistleblowing on.

[11:10 -> 14:54]

Joe Rogan:

How did you initially discover this program, and what was your first encounter with the information?

David Grusch:

A very senior individual in the intelligence community came to me when I was asking a lot of questions because I'm a very inquisitive guy. He said, "Hey, I need to introduce you to somebody." He listed that person's academic credentials, which were beyond reproach—PhD level education, an impressive clearance, and an incredible resume. I thought, "Okay, sure, I'll talk to this person." I ended up meeting that individual in a top-secret facility.

He started discussing how he was involved in a program where we were reverse engineering crash material that we had recovered over the decades. He emphasized, "I'm not joking." He explained that we needed to report this to the Deputy Secretary of Defense and Congress. We were actively briefing Secretary Esper, Deputy Secretary Norquist, and other cabinet-level officials.

There seemed to be an oversight issue because the UAP task force should have been read into this information. Why spend taxpayer dollars looking at things we already have data on? That spooked me, and this was in the fall of 2019. I don't take someone's word for it, so I, along with my trusted colleagues who had significant special access, cultivated our network. We ultimately interviewed about 40 people, including multi-star generals, directors of agencies, and mid-level personnel who had directly worked on these matters.

They provided me with intelligence reports, documents, and a lot of information that I could cross-verify with other sources. I had enough information to know who specifically to ask, saying, "I want to be read into this. I'm on the UAP task force." We approached those I'll call "gatekeepers," and they basically said no to me and my colleagues.

So, why were these other people willing to discuss this with you?

They determined that I didn't need to know, as I was already cleared at such a high level, handling presidential material and everything. They felt that coming to us was a form of protected disclosure. They believed they weren't violating anything because we were the investigatory body for the Department of Defense and the intelligence community, as well as Congress at the time. They knew that they were allowed to disclose information to a government official in an official capacity.

I did that, and of course, I protected those individuals. Many of them eventually came to the Intelligence Community Inspector General when I filed my complaint because I didn't want people to hear it from a secondhand source. People can say whatever they want, but I have firsthand knowledge that I eventually plan to discuss. I'm trying to

get it cleared through security processes so they could hear it.

[14:57 -> 18:47]

David Grusch:

I heard the details, like, you know, who, what, when, where, why, and where the [___] is. Who's in control of it? What are the cover programs, etc.? So, that's what deemed my complaint credible and urgent in July 2022. My complaint, yes, was about reprisal too. I filed that separately eventually to the Department of Defense Inspector General. That's an ongoing investigation. But my congressional oversight UAP crash retrieval allegations were deemed credible and urgent. It was sent to the Director of National Intelligence and then to the Congressional intelligence committees around that time in July 2022. I eventually went to Congress in December 2022, and it's a crazy story why it took so long. It's [___] nuts.

I provided a total of about 11 and a half to 12 hours of classified testimony to the Congressional staffers and their lawyers for both the House and the Senate. I went, you know, full open kimono. I mean, I told them as much as I could within my time slot, if you will. So, this is obviously very compartmentalized, where there are only a few people who know about this information, and they're not allowed to discuss it with others.

When did this all start? I mean, is this out of Roswell? Does it predate that? When did they first realize that there are things that cannot be explained or can't be explained through conventional means? Yeah, I mean, the program goes back ways. The precise beginning of it, I can't talk about due to security reasons. But I did talk publicly about the 1933 retrieval, and I did that tactically. I ran that through the security approval office because I wanted to show that this is much older and international. It's not just a U.S. thing. I mean, this stuff is landing or crashing around the world, and unexpected countries have had this happen. That's why I picked that case because I thought it was interesting.

Then, of course, Pope Pius XII and the Vatican were involved, back channeling it through the OSS, which became the CIA later, to FDR. That's how the U.S. knew something weird happened in Italy right before World War II. So, this 1933 incident was the first documented case that I can talk about. There's something that predates that, but you could infer that.

Yeah, so this 1933 incident you mentioned was in Italy, right? Magenta? I'm bad at geography; I think that's in the Lombardy region, which is in Northern Northwest Italy. What's the story behind it? So, basically, it looked like it crashed. The original shape most likely was like a lenticular disc-like craft, you know, with two dinner plates.

What does lenticular mean?

So, like two dinner plates, you know, smooshed together, right? There's a hump, and there's like a bubble on top—classic, like that.

But it looks like when it hit, the edges broke off, so it became this bell or acorn-shaped thing. There was nothing in it; it was just an artifact. There were no biological remnants, if you will.

It's so funny because the Italians were so confused. They actually called up the Germans and were like, "Is this one of yours? What the hell just crashed in Northern Italy?" Mussolini. This is all publicly available information because...

[18:48 -> 22:28]

David Grusch:

Some Italian researchers found all these original documents that some people had been sitting on for years in Italy. They put a gag order on the press, etc. Melini asked the Germans to come down, and of course, the Germans came down and were like, "That is not ours, but let's look at it together." So that's kind of perhaps a tertiary reason the Axis powers got together. I'm not saying that's the reason, but I think the Italians and the Germans were so intrigued with what they found from an artifact perspective. There was at least some scientific and military collaboration during the war, the details of which I'm not sure of, but I know people who know about that specific event and are currently still intelligence officers within this program in detail.

So, were there witnesses to the crash or some sort of understanding that something had crash-landed and then they discovered it? I forget the precise discovery. I don't know if it was local police officers or local farmers who found it in the field, something like that. I don't want to speak out of turn. I assume some of the Italian researchers might have some fact witnesses who can orally say, "Oh yeah, my great-grandfather found it," or something like that. But I don't remember what the scale of this vehicle was. It was probably like 20 feet by 10 feet, something like that—not super huge, but kind of big.

Do they think that this was a drone? Do they think that this was occupied? There was nothing in it, so if it was piloted, if you will, by some sentience, I mean, your guess is as good as mine. So, what happened to that vehicle? We knew where it was being stored at a particular location after the crash, and then the military came in, and we grabbed it towards the end of the war, you know, 1944-1945.

Because, like I said, Pope Pius XII already kind of let FDR know. Why did the Pope get involved? Because it's Italy. Interestingly enough, there's a whole history of human intelligence prior to World War II, and old money—the Vatican, the Italian mob—kind of the old country boys did a lot of informal intelligence collection for the U.S. There are probably some books you can read on it, but it's really interesting. Human intelligence collection wasn't really formalized until the Office of Strategic Services, the OSS, which became the CIA in 1947.

You had Paul Mellon and all these other affluent guys from old money families who basically created the CIA, so that's probably the reason why. This thing that was recovered was the first documented one that the United States had access to. I can't get into whether it was the

first or not, but it was an early one—very early. Yes, so it's almost a hundred years ago.

So, they take this thing, and then they bring it—where? I can't get into those details. Okay, so they bring it somewhere in the United States, and was the attempt to try to back-engineer this thing? Was the attempt to try to understand what it was? Yeah, I mean, first of all, it's obviously about understanding the situation—what do we have our hands on? And like I've said in some other videos and stuff, we took the Manhattan Project secrecy and overlaid it on this issue because that secrecy worked well for the atomic bomb.

[22:31 -> 26:07]

David Grusch:

Developments and whatnot, and certainly this whole program, in a nutshell, if I were to summarize the 90-plus years of history, it is a reverse engineering program to garner some kind of insight. Of course, not a lot of the things that we've learned from it are directly ripped off the technology we found, but it has inspired other innovations that have made their way into other U.S. classified programs over the years for national defense reasons. You know, it's a myriad of different things. The UFO folklore is that this is where fiber optics were discovered first.

I'm not going to break the seal on anything we've discovered or anything like that. It's a place I can't go. How limited are you in what you can discuss, and why do they let you discuss any of this?

So, anything sensitive that I want to say as it relates to U.S. government activity, whether it be intelligence stuff, military stuff, etc., I have to submit it through what they call the DOD Office of Pre-Publication and Security Review. That is something anyone who's been an intel officer or anyone with a clearance has to submit. Now, obviously, if you're writing a book about gardening, you don't have to, but if you're going to talk about anything military and intelligence-related, you have to submit.

So, it's kind of a catch-22 for this office, right? They're only looking at it from a security perspective; they're not vouching for it or anything like that. And that's like any author, right? They could write a book about Navy SEALs, and they're not vouching for the story; they're vouching that you didn't say any nasty code words or burn a specific ongoing classified program.

For them, I mean, I'm not in their loop, but certainly, it's a catch-22 for them. If they want to redact and they propose a redaction, they're like, "Hey, Dave, you can't say these sentences. You can rewrite it and resubmit." You know, we can't necessarily tell you what agency said to redact it, but you're not allowed to say this. They would be basically self-certifying there's a "there" there.

In my opinion, probably the policy is like if it has to deal with the subject, we're not saying anything. We're not proposing any redactions as long as he's not burning a conventional program. We kind of have to

allow him to exercise his First Amendment rights. So, I think it's like a catch-22 for that office; that's kind of the long or the short of the long answer.

So, this is essentially one of the very early ones, 1933. How many crash retrieval incidents have there been? It is double digits. The specific numbers I do know; however, I can't discuss that. I know it sounds like, "Oh, I'm being coy," or whatever, but you know this show and any other interviews I do, right? Foreign intelligence services are watching, and it's like I'm not here to help Russia and China calibrate their intelligence collection. Like, "Oh, Dave said it's this number; we missed a couple." Let's put it out for the KGB, SVR, and GRU, who are now going to hit the streets to try to figure out which ones they missed.

So, I'm here to protect national security, and I'm just trying to put all the general topics out there for public conversation, to hold our government accountable, really. Because I'm here as a fact witness, we have a constitutional oversight issue.

[26:10 -> 29:57]

David Grusch:

The program has not been reported to Congress in the appropriate way. I can explain to you why I'm so sure, besides what I read, which we can get into regarding the Intel Port reports. I did get some information cleared. During my investigation, I thought it was essential to talk to someone at the highest levels. This will give you an idea of the kind of people we talk to. This is the only individual I will mention by name because they passed away two years ago. In Spring 2021, I flew with a couple of colleagues to Las Vegas and met with Senator Harry Reid about nine months before he died. Of course, he was a private citizen at that time, and I wanted to brief him on the topic and get his thoughts because he was a member of the Gang of Eight, which consists of the topmost cleared senators and congressmen. He was also the majority leader of the Senate, and I knew he helped sponsor the AATIP program that I mentioned, which looked at Skinwalker Ranch and other phenomena. I wanted to understand what Harry Reid actually knew and why he allocated \$21 million to the DIA and Bigelow Aerospace for this.

I was sitting in Harry Reid's living room, right next to him, with some other witnesses present. He straight up said, "Yeah, I knew we had UFO material. I was denied access for decades. I tried to get access." He explained some of his efforts during AATIP, and I thought, "Holy [expletive], did the former Majority Leader just confirm this to me?" I was already talking to these amazing high-level people, but here I had Harry Reid literally saying, "Yes, we have material," and he knew it was non-human. Did Harry Reid have personal experiences with this? I don't know if he had any personal encounters in his life. Did he see it? Did he witness the material himself? He mentioned he was denied access for years-decades, as he put it. He also told me that he had a weekly call with President Joe Biden at the time and said he was going to discuss this issue with him.

what he shared about AATIP was astonishing. I had about 20 other people who told me similar things. The real history of AATIP is often misunderstood; many people think they were looking at ghosts at Skinwalker Ranch. Yes, they visited the ranch as a secondary and tertiary objective, but the primary reason was different. A couple of years ago, a document was released through FOIA from the Defense Intelligence Agency. It detailed a special access program request that Harry Reid sent to Deputy Secretary of Defense William Lynn. It was asking for one of the most serious special access programs, known as a bigoted waived special access program. "waived" means it has limited Congressional reporting. This is a class of special access programs, and "bigoted" means it is by name. The FOIA document included names like Harry Reid, James Inhofe, and others. I was left wondering why...

[30:01 -> 33:53]

David Grusch:

Are you asking for the most serious SAP to be created for a program that ostensibly is looking at Skinwalker Ranch and stuff? It doesn't make any sense. So what really happened there? You know, Harry Reid—God bless his soul—made this disclosure a couple of weeks after we met in the New Yorker. You can look this up; I think it was a May 2021 New Yorker story where he says, "I knew for decades," and he made this disclosure, not me. So I'm going to say the name of the contractor. Harry Reid said this: we knew that Lockheed Martin had this material for decades. I tried to get access, and I was denied. Specifically, with the Lockheed Martin stuff, he was talking about during the AATIP program. For the people who are on this program, I submitted this to DOS and got this cleared, so don't freak out, but I'm telling the truth here. Lockheed Martin wanted to divest itself from this material at a specific facility that's known to me, and I provided that to the Inspector General—like street address and all that.

The idea was if they made a security catcher's mitt for this material at the most serious SAP possible, the contractor and the other government customer, which was the Central Intelligence Agency, would handle that specific locked material. It was material that they recovered from the '50s and stuff—bits and pieces of hull structure and like that. They were going to tech transfer it, and the \$21 or \$22 million was actually for Bigelow Aerospace to build out facilities in Las Vegas and material analysis equipment. I have seen the staff meeting slides; I saw the paperwork. There's a paperwork trail I've seen on this, and I talked to the people involved in this program. Even Jim Lacatsky, who ran the program and is a retired DIA officer with a PhD in engineering, made this disclosure in his book, "Skinwalkers at the Pentagon," pages 152 to 153. He also made a disclosure a couple of weeks ago, I think it was on the Weaponized podcast with Jeremy Corbell and George Knapp, where he said, "Yeah, we had a whole craft, and we broke into the hull, and we gained access." He ran that through the same security process as I did.

So Jim Lacatsky, who ran this program, is also going on the record that he is personally aware of intact vehicles and everything. But what does that mean? By what method did they gain access? The way he

wrote it in his book, I can only infer it sounded forcible. So through some kind of means—I don't know if it was like a CO2 laser or something. I don't actually know how they gained access, but I imagine it was not permissive access; they broke into the damn thing. So this thing is essentially sealed, and it's some sort of—what was the shape of this thing? He didn't disclose the shape of this particular vehicle as far as I know, nor the dimensions. I don't believe he did in his book, but I think it's like chapter 11 in his new book or something. I glanced at it, but he did make that disclosure on video as well.

I do encourage both the Arrow Office, which is the DOD's UAP task force successor, and Congress to ask Dr. James Lacatsky to come in for classified testimony because the disclosure in his book, which he wrote with Colum Keller and George Knapp, and in the second book—well, the guy is saying he has close personal knowledge. He needs to go to Congress.

[33:56 -> 37:36]

David Grusch:

I know James Latsky, but I do encourage him to be a fact witness. Going back to that transfer with Lockheed, long story short, I can't get into all the nuanced details, but basically the CIA sent you to DIA, and Lockheed was totally killed. So, Harry Reid's request to get the material transferred to the AATIP program was completely shut down because of bureaucracy and other factors. They used that money, and then they wrote those Defense Intelligence Reference Documents, or DIRDs, as a lot of people familiar with it will know. They also looked at Skinwalker Ranch because they thought that studying the more unusual phenomenon aspects of this would help them gain favor with the CIA to unlock the key for the Lockheed material.

I'll tell you right now, it's so weird to say this, but I ran that through security. To me, it feels like an out-of-body experience to talk about that kind of sensitive information. Basically, they studied the ranch to gain favor, saying, "Hey, look at all this stuff we're figuring out about this paranormal activity that's somehow connected to the phenomenon at the ranch." Ultimately, they never gained favor with the government customer, and the program kind of died a slow death due to a lot of politics in the Pentagon.

That's the long and short of it with the AATIP program. I wanted to make sure the public knew it's not what you think it was; there were other things behind the scenes that I wanted to speak truth to power about.

So, this particular vehicle that they recovered from the 1950s—what was the source of it? Where did they find it?
Those details I did not get cleared.

So, they have in their possession this thing. They gain access to it, and what do they report once they've gained access to it?
Oh, those details I do not know. That's probably a question for Dr. Latsky. I presume he knows those details; I don't know.

So, this thing is housed somewhere?

Yes, currently it may still be in the same location that I know about.

And how many people have access to this, and how did they prevent this information from being released?

It goes back to the compartmentalization and the ecosystem of secrecy in this community. Only a limited number of people, at least at the time, were on Lockheed Martin's side. Lockheed Martin was complaining, basically saying, "Look, the secrecy is ridiculous. We can't even bring in the right engineers." Imagine you're a hotshot engineer, fresh out of grad school, maybe the best PhD electrical engineer. You want to do cool work, you want to publish papers, and you want to climb the corporate ladder.

Then a Lockheed Martin executive comes to you and says, "Yeah, dude, I can show you something really crazy, but you're never going to publish papers on it."

[37:38 -> 41:02]

David Grusch:

You're never going to be able to tell people what you worked on, and it's probably not the most career-enhancing. But if you want to work on something cool, I can't tell you because it's unacknowledged until you sign this piece of paper, a non-disclosure agreement. Sorry, but here's the raw deal. A lot of people are like, "No." It's not like Lockheed Martin could broadcast this to universities saying, "Come work for us; you'll work on crazy stuff." That is very akin to a lot of other black programs in the government that are unacknowledged in nature. You don't know what you're signing up for until you get briefed in. I've been briefed on a lot of that kind of conventional stuff in my career.

One of the problems that Bob Lazar discussed was that science can't really operate in a vacuum. When you separate the metallurgists from the propulsion experts and the biological experts, and they're not allowed to communicate with each other or bring in other experts, that creates frustration. I had some friends I've known for almost 14 years. I literally know them personally. I had a relationship with them, but they ended up spilling the beans. They said, "Look, we're on the program. I'm an engineer for X, Y, and Z. We can't even cross-talk across the cubicles for God's sake."

I'm looking at Material X, doing some x-ray diffraction testing on it, which involves shooting a stream of electrons and seeing how it bends and looking at the atomic arrangements. I can't even cross-talk about that with another aspect of the program. This is ridiculous, and that's kind of their frustration.

I knew you were probably going to ask me about Bob Lazar; I figured as much. Why did they do that, though? If everybody was already sworn to secrecy and everyone has NDAs, it seems like the most effective way of reverse engineering or at least gaining an understanding of how these things are structured.

That's exactly how the Manhattan Project was. People working on the fuses for the bomb didn't necessarily know it was going to a nuclear weapon. I've seen this kind of compartmentalization and secrecy in other programs, and it is debilitating for progress. Honestly, as a fiduciary of taxpayer dollars, it's not the best modus operandi to do it that way. Very few people had that top-down view to look across the silos and see what was going on. It became very dysfunctional. They were afraid of people being too cross-briefed into different silos for counter-espionage and counter-intelligence.

You have to remember, a bulk of this program was done during the Cold war, and we were afraid of Russian spies and Soviet moles. We made it ultra-locked down, but to the detriment of national security. That was one of the crazy things that motivated me to whistleblow because I thought, "This is so stupid; we should be making more progress on this."

Were there any breaches that you're aware of where foreign agents were able to gain access to materials or an understanding of what we know?

I'll tell you about some intel documents I read that kind of obliquely answer that question.

[41:05 -> 45:03]

David Grusch:

I had access to the ATIP and ASSAP classified archives, and I was thumbing through everything. Some other people were bringing me documents to evaluate. I'll never forget when I came across an assessment stolen by the U.S. from a certain foreign adversary discussing the U.S. reverse engineering program. That was another moment of realization for me. An adversary also confirmed this program through exfiltrated intelligence, indicating they had at least limited knowledge that the U.S. had a program like this.

I wanted to know more, so I sought out the agency through the approved and official channels. This was part of the reprisals against me. The agency said, "Oh yes, we have what you're looking for, Dave. You're going to need to sign a one-time reading agreement and come visit us to read it in the Vault." They confirmed they had the information I was seeking.

Ultimately, from what I was told by friends in higher places, my request went up the flagpole at that agency, and suddenly, they ghosted my boss and me for about two months. When I pressed them hard for access, explaining that I had a need to know to evaluate this intelligence for Congress, they debriefed me from all my accesses at that sister agency. They made up some bogus excuse, claiming I shouldn't have been briefed in the first place. It felt like they were giving me an administrative middle finger, essentially saying, "Don't ever ask us about that again."

I'm sure the person who initially told me they had what I was looking for probably faced consequences because I never heard from them again,

even though I used to work with them occasionally. This experience was another indication that there was a lot of smoke and fire surrounding these issues.

Knowing that our adversaries were aware of this reverse engineering program, are we aware of their reverse engineering programs? Yes, we have some knowledge. You could probably guess which countries are involved, and it wouldn't be too shocking. However, I won't disclose what the U.S. may know.

Are we aware of the numbers in terms of at least a rough estimate of how many programs are available to these other countries? Yes, there are more than one. You can read into that. Has anyone made any progress? I can't discuss whether we've made progress or if they've made progress because that's classified national security information.

But I want to be clear: I want the U.S. populace to learn a lot of this information. This is another reason why I went public. I need to call attention to these issues. I'm not here to admonish the entire government, but there is an element within the U.S. government and its defense contractor base that presents a three-branch oversight issue. Going back to Harry Reid, he didn't even get access to the information. I spoke to him.

[45:04 -> 48:52]

David Grusch:

I spoke to someone to confirm that, and he mentioned he was going to talk to Biden because I believe there needs to be a disclosure plan. This ties back to what's currently in legislation, which is incredibly important. Approximately 90 percent of this information should be open for public discovery, public analysis, and academic scrutiny. This should be treated similarly to nuclear programs; for instance, nuclear physics is studied in universities, while nuclear weapons information is classified because it poses significant risks. We don't need everyone to know how to create that.

I think the information that pertains to legitimate weapons and national superiority should be reasonably classified. However, we need a change regarding these programs. That's why you saw the Schumer Amendment. I believe you might have read about that on air or something in a previous episode. I knew about the amendment a couple of months before I went public, and that was another reason I decided to take action. I felt like I was the only person who had the opportunity to do this. I was aware of what Chuck Schumer and his staff had in the Schumer Amendment, which is 67 pages of content aimed at disclosure. I felt compelled to go public because I could sense the hesitation on Capitol Hill to act without something to point to publicly. I thought, "I'll be that guy."

A month after I went public, I believe I pushed Chuck Schumer over the edge. I know he discussed the amendment with the White House because it's unlikely that he would propose groundbreaking legislation without consulting the National Security Adviser or the President. The

amendment is called the UAP Disclosure Act of 2023, known as the Schumer Amendment. It has co-sponsors like Senators Gillibrand, Rubio, Rounds, and Young. Kudos to those Senators for stepping up because they recognize the reality of this situation. I am aware of the meetings they've had with individuals who are even more credible than I am.

This act, which is extremely important, is currently in conference on Capitol Hill. The amendment is wrapped within the Fiscal Year 2024 National Defense Authorization Act, which essentially funds the military every year. The act is lengthy, but the core of it is about halfway through, discussing a presidential panel or agency consisting of nine members and a controlled UAP disclosure plan that spans six years, from 2024 to 2030. This panel, which anyone can read about in public law, is intended to include scientists, sociologists, and others who would help craft the plan for the President. This entire bill was actually modeled after the JFK Records Act. While it's true that not all records were released, we included provisions to enforce the issue, such as eminent domain and other measures. However, it's important to note that the Chief Executive, the President, has the final say, and the panel cannot compel the executive.

[48:55 -> 52:39]

David Grusch:

I hope the president does support this, and I support it as well. The Senate has already passed it, so we're good to go. However, there is pushback in the House right now that is, pardon my language, ridiculous. They claim it's duplicating the Department of Defense's Arrow office activities. While they are doing good work—looking at UAP reports to differentiate between balloons, air trash, and other unusual phenomena—they're also conducting a historical review to understand the U.S. history on this matter. The problem is that this agency is within the DOD and not above it, which creates issues when trying to reach into the Department of Energy and other cabinet-level agencies.

What we need is a presidential-level panel that can declassify information, reach into other agencies, and inform certain secretaries that we want their information under presidential authority. From what I've been told by people on the Hill who are working on this issue, the chair of the House Intelligence Committee, Mike Turner, is blocking this. He's from the Dayton, Ohio area, near Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. I'm also surprised by Mike Rogers from Alabama, who is the chair of the House Armed Services Committee.

I have a problem with both Mikes right now. Remember, I went to Turner's committee last December. He wasn't there, but his staff and lawyers were present. After the hearing, he went on Fox Business and didn't even mention my name, referring to me as just a whistleblower and claiming I had no idea what I was talking about. I asked him, "Mike, have you ever been an Intel officer or served in the military?" Oh wait, you were the mayor of Dayton, Ohio, and you were voted the most corrupt person in Congress a couple of years ago. Just look at his PAC donors—Lockheed Martin and Boeing.

If he thought he needed more information or wanted to talk to me personally, why didn't he call me back when I reported to his committee? Furthermore, besides blocking the bill, I'm sure you're familiar with Representative Tim Burchett from Alabama. He has been very outspoken on this issue. We may not agree on everything, but he has been a champion on the oversight committee and was one of the members I testified before under oath regarding this matter.

Now, Mike Turner is reportedly looking to fund an opposition candidate for Tim's re-election in 2024. Why is Mike Turner going out of his way to destroy the career of a courageous Tennessee representative on the oversight committee? Why is he blocking a bill that would only cost a couple of million a year at most for the panel, which is essentially vaporware in U.S. government speak? If there's nothing to see here, why are Mike Rogers and Mike Turner in the House blocking this bill? In my opinion, this is the most important legislation for transparency in American history. If there's nothing to see here, then why are the multi-star generals I talk to considered crazy? Are the Intel documents I read incorrect? Are they forgeries or something else? Good friends of mine have worked on this.

[52:42 -> 56:28]

David Grusch:

The program is bullshitting me in some consorted operation against me and my colleagues. It would be totally crazy to even conduct that because I took precautions. So why don't we just pass this and see what happens? What do you think the answer to that is? Special interests want to keep the genie in the bottle, even though the toothpaste is coming out of the tube. I think it's like a death rattle in this industrial complex that doesn't want change. I'm not here to be some total adversary; I think there needs to be a Truth and Reconciliation process on this issue. I'm not here to throw people in jail, nor am I here for big contractors involved to lose money. I believe this would be a boon, and I think the leadership in these companies needs to consider this. If we're more open about this, you can hire people and push the subject into undergraduate and post-doctoral programs for research to study this in an unclassified manner, just like nuclear physics. This answers a fundamental question for humanity: Are we alone? Or, you know, what happens when we die? Well, I don't know about that, but are we alone? The answer is we are not alone, and I know that with 100% certainty. As an intelligence officer, you never say 100%, but all signs point towards this based on the people I've talked to, like Harry Reid. I use him as an example, but I talk to the highest of the high people you could possibly talk to, if you catch my drift. Unless all of them are lying and covering up something else, which I don't even know what that would be at this point, because the phenomenon is real. It's been going on for thousands of years; people have been seeing strange things, and not everybody is mass hallucinating. That's kind of my long diatribe about what's happening. What do they think these things are, the people that you talk to? Specifically, the people on the program that handled the material and were in executive-level briefings with intelligence community leaders and others over the years, they did use the term

"extraterrestrial" or "ET" as a possible origin. However, the Schumer Amendment, if you read it, specifically uses "non-human intelligence" (NHII) very deliberately because we want to catch everything. What if some of this stuff is not ET? They could use that as an escape clause, saying, "well, this stuff we don't even know if it's extraterrestrial, so this doesn't apply." That's why we wanted to be as broad as possible. Besides ET, I think we have a couple of conceivable buckets, and I'm using the work of Jacques Vallée and others who have thought deeply on the issue regarding how the phenomenon has changed since antiquity. It showed itself in a different way. A good example is the witches sitting on your chest phenomenon, which involved paralysis in the medieval and Enlightenment eras, and it became this alien abduction phenomenon in the modern era. Is it the recipient and their analytical overlay cognitively seeing the phenomenon based on a modern interpretation, or is the phenomenon itself? This is like Jacques Vallée's book, "Passport to Magonia," where he talks about how the phenomenon seems to masquerade.

[56:31 -> 59:57]

David Grusch:

Itself has manifested in different forms over the years, but we've seen roughly the same phenomena. If you look at the Foo Fighters of world war II, there are declassified Air Force OSI reports from the 1950s that people can Google, which discuss flying butane tanks with measurements approximately similar to what we observed in the 2004 Tic Tac incident. They referred to them as flying propane or butane tanks back then. From a morphological perspective, or as we call it in Air Force intelligence, visual reconnaissance, they essentially look the same. We can trace this back decades, if not hundreds of years. For instance, in the wheels of Ezekiel, people reported seeing disc-shaped objects. Unless Ezekiel was experiencing some sort of hallucination or if this is merely an allegory or fable in the Bible, we have to consider the events described, much like those in the Vedic texts, which mention battles involving blue beings and conflicts in the sky that sound reminiscent of nuclear and directed energy weapons. What's going on there? Perhaps this is something that Graham Hancock or Randall Carlson could elaborate on, as they have more knowledge in this area.

There is a real phenomenon with an undetermined origin, and it can sometimes present itself in a non-corporeal form, such as orbs or balls of light. They don't appear as bipedal hominids, as some have suggested. I think this could be described as interdimensional or as part of a shadow biome or crypto-terrestrial theory. There are many different theories, but the primary ones suggest origins from another planet or another dimension. Those seem to be the main ideas.

Certainly, there are origins that we may not be able to conceptualize as humans because our physical forms are limited to three dimensions, and our cognitive abilities have their constraints. There might be some origins related to interdimensional travel that we simply do not understand. If you speak to mainstream physicists, they often say that crossing dimensions physically is more of a trope from science fiction. I understand that some physicists may not appreciate my

discussion of this theory, but it is indeed a theory.

For example, the holographic principle was originally conceived to explain how information is encoded on the event horizon of a black hole, which is a distance away from the singularity. If you cross that threshold, you're essentially doomed because you would be ripped to shreds or you wouldn't come back. This principle suggests that information from higher-dimensional space can be encoded in lower-dimensional space. A simple analogy is us casting a shadow on a sidewalk: a three-dimensional object creates a two-dimensional shadow. If you lived in a two-dimensional space, you would be perplexed by what you were seeing, not realizing it was just a person from a higher-dimensional space.

So, while we have physical materials in three-dimensional space that we've recovered, perhaps some of the phenomena are actually operating in higher spatial dimensions, either being projected or quasi-projected into our reality.

[1:00:00 -> 1:03:40]

David Grusch:

Our three-dimensional plus time space is really trippy to think about, but we literally experience it on a day-to-day basis, like casting shadows. That might be some of what we're seeing too. However, I presume we know more than the people I talked to did. They did not have full knowledge either. Like I said, the normal assumption was to say "ET" or "extraterrestrial."

Could you simplify this concept of interdimensionality?

What I know in physics is that they have theorized there are multiple dimensions beyond those we can currently detect. A lot of that is based on... this is my bachelor's degree talking, so I know there will be some physicists with PhDs who might critique this, but basically, from high-energy particle collisions and based on the reflection angles and all the phenomena that occur when particles collide, we can confirm certain theoretical frameworks about extra spatial dimensions.

I can't speak with any real authority on precisely how that works, but many theories, whether it be string theory or quantum mechanics, are based on higher spatial dimensions. This is a mainstream physics theoretical framework; it's not wacky or loony or anything like that. So, that's basically a possibility.

However, like I said, we don't really have a good theory. If you lived in, say, five-dimensional space, it's almost like... remember the ending of the movie "Interstellar"? He's pushing the books; he's in a tesseract, which is like a four- or five-dimensional structure. He's trying to interact with three-dimensional space, and of course, he leaves that space to come back to his daughter many years later at the end of the movie. Great movie!

So, that's a way to conceptualize it, something you may have watched

in film. It's kind of like the ending of "Interstellar."

Oh yeah, there you go.

which is based on what theory? The physicist Kip Thorne is a very famous guy; he was a big black hole and wormhole expert. I think he's at Caltech or somewhere in California. Kip Thorne actually did all the physics equations and everything for Christopher Nolan to ensure that they were conceptualizing and visualizing black holes and wormholes correctly in the movie.

You saw the halo around the black hole when they were approaching with the ship; that's actually based on real physics models that Kip Thorne calculated, which is pretty cool that Christopher Nolan took it to that level.

So, this idea that these beings, or whatever you want to call them, exist in some other dimension... do we have any understanding? Do we have any sort of communication with these beings that gives us some sort of understanding or a map of this?

Yeah, the interaction stuff is a sensitive area. There were multiple very senior people who were concerned about discussing that kind of information with me. I mean, as crazy as it sounds, that was a real subject of conversation. Even if it sounds like something out of "Star Trek: First Contact," it doesn't if you have vehicles.

Once you realize the phenomenon is real, then you realize we've recovered...

[1:03:43 -> 1:07:25]

David Grusch:

Artifacts and biologics, or dead pilots, if you will, even though it's kind of creepy to think about that in your worldview. You don't think they were ever alive sometimes too, right? I'll leave it at that only because that is something the president and his cabinet needed to disclose in a controlled manner. Going back to that amendment, I'm not here to push the subject in an improper way. It sounds like, "why don't you just do it, Dave?" But there are a lot of secondary and tertiary ramifications—economically, theologically, and our geopolitical relationships with allies and adversaries. This is not a simple "rip off the Band-Aid" situation. There's a lot of complex stuff behind the scenes that needs to happen. That's why I'm laying out all the general stuff that needs to be discussed during the disclosure process.

I should not be the one disclosing this information, and it would be highly inappropriate for me to do so because I care about the health of the United States and its people, as well as national security. I know there are people who wonder, "why doesn't Dave say X, Y, and Z?" This is serious; this is not just a casual conversation. I am a serious person. I risked my career doing this. I was on track to make lieutenant colonel in the Air Force this winter. I was on track to become a flag officer equivalent in my civilian career. I spent 18

years in uniform, if you count my time as a cadet. My whole adult life has been dedicated to serving as an intelligence officer, but I wanted to see change.

So, I'm throwing the flag out, and I'm here to hold the government accountable to do the right thing in a mature and thorough manner. I don't claim to know everything about the different ramifications of saying certain things publicly. I don't know all the answers, and that's why I have to be careful. I don't even know the collateral damage effects—using a military term—of certain things that might be revealed, as there are aspects I am not privy to. This is a serious situation; it's not just a fun topic. This could potentially change humanity, hopefully for the better.

I have risked my personal and professional life to be public like this. I swore an oath, and my generation wants to see change. Can you discuss the things that have happened to you personally?

Yes, a lot of the stuff I have to be purposely vague about because there is an open Inspector General reprisal investigation on my behalf. I'm not here to compromise the investigation by tipping off any parties that may be watching right now. When I really started looking into this, they came after me hard to try to revoke my clearance. They ruined my career, kicked me out of my agency, and accused me of everything you could possibly think of with no evidence. For example, at first, they wanted to say, "Oh, Dave, you have mental health issues that you didn't report to us. We're concerned because we think you might have an ongoing mental health issue."

[1:07:28 -> 1:11:07]

David Grusch:

What are you talking about? I reported that I had PTSD from Afghanistan during my military service several years ago, and I sought help for that. I'm not ashamed of it. You know, I'm high-functioning autistic, and I didn't know that until my early thirties. I didn't really understand how I processed trauma until many years later. I sought help for that, and they were trying to say that I had some secret mental health problem that I hadn't been reporting. So, I had to go through this whole process where three agencies investigated me for that, which I don't even know if that's legal. They tried to say that I mishandled classified information and all this other stuff. It was insane. Apparently, I was under criminal investigation for a couple of months, and I didn't even know it. They didn't even interview me, but they made a finding against me with no evidence, which I had to spend money to litigate to maintain my employment and my clearance. For the record, I maintained my clearance. I resigned with full access; I'm just debriefed now, but I maintained my top-secret eligibility, and I left of my own accord.

And, of course, they ruined one of my boss's careers in another agency. They walked him out of the building, revoked his clearance, and terminated him as a show of force after they were going after me. I feel sorry for that individual. They also came after my co-workers, but I can't get into who, what, when, where, and why to protect their

identities and their own processes. So, that's what happened to me professionally.

Then, what happened to me personally was very disturbing. I have to be vague about this because of an ongoing investigation, but I think you'll understand what I'm saying. They showed my wife and me that they could touch me at any time—two times—and it was very disturbing. This was in conjunction with some other people receiving a similar message, some of whom are publicly well-known and some who aren't. Of course, I immediately reported that to Counter Intelligence, federal law enforcement, and local authorities because it wasn't criminal, but it felt like a threat to me. This was right before I filed my whistleblower complaint.

I don't know who did this or what entity was responsible for it, but it happened. I provided that documentation to a couple of special agents, and I just knew that it was getting serious. First of all, I'm the kind of person from Pittsburgh, you know, steel town. I don't take nonsense from people. I decided to file an inspector general complaint to protect myself. I'm in fear for my safety. My wife is an Air Force veteran too, a very strong individual, but as a man, you don't want to put your family at risk. I took certain other measures, which I won't talk about, to protect myself physically. I could not believe that this was happening to me. No kidding. I knew I needed to do something internally, and when I saw the writing on the wall earlier this year, I knew about the Schumer Amendment.

[1:11:08 -> 1:14:45]

David Grusch:

I mentioned earlier that I knew I had to do this for my own protection. Leaving federal service, resigning my Air Force commission, meant I completely threw away that career to do what I believed was the right and patriotic thing: to whistleblow on this issue. I swore my oath 18 years ago, and while that may sound hokey, I truly believe in the Air Force motto: Integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do. I realize this is not going to help me personally, but I love talking to you and spreading this message because it's the right and ethical thing to do. However, this is a nightmare for me. I don't want to be public. I've served the country in clandestine and covert operations for 14 years and have been involved in technical intelligence for some of the most high-profile takedowns in U.S. history. I shouldn't even be here, but I am because I want to see change. I witnessed something unethical and immoral, and I want to ensure that element of the government is held accountable. It was the right thing to do, and I get emotional about it because my career has been about service and sacrifice.

I had two friends die, and I've talked about this publicly before. I'm segueing a little bit, but the suffering of American intelligence officers is something that we need to address. People don't realize the kind of trauma intelligence professionals endure. For instance, six months after I returned from Afghanistan, I lost a friend named Captain Dave Lyon. There's a park at Peterson Space Force Base named after him. I remember seeing him come off the plane, and I witnessed

him die. That affected me for years and contributed to many of the problems I ended up dealing with.

Then, I remarried, and my best man, Captain Ben Heiney, an Air Force intelligence officer from Special Operations Command, was my closest friend. Tragically, 28 days after my wedding, he suffered from depression. As his best friend, he didn't confide in me. I remember chatting with him on the phone one day, and just a few hours later, he walked into his backyard and took his own life. I gave his eulogy at his funeral, and that profoundly affected me.

What Ben experienced is something I can't fully disclose, but imagine being the person who decides that someone is a threat and then has to live with the consequences of that decision. You essentially play God, and then you go back to your wife and kids at the end of your shift. I faced similar situations during my time overseas, involved in interrogations and operations where I had to determine if a target posed enough of a threat to warrant a life-altering decision for them and their family. This silent suffering is prevalent among intelligence professionals, especially during the Global War on Terror, which lasted about 21 years. The trauma and mental toll it takes is significant.

[1:14:48 -> 1:18:32]

David Grusch:

There are health problems that people experience from being an intelligence professional in an operational environment. People often think of special operators, pilots, and ground troops, and while they certainly have their own trauma, there is this insidious question: "Am I in a video game? Is this real?" This is a unique trauma that intelligence professionals face. I wanted to highlight this during the show because it is something that is near and dear to me. It's important for people to be aware of the service provided by military intelligence and civilian intelligence professionals who have to make really tough decisions for the country that affect people's lives on the receiving end.

Was there a concern while you were going through all this that if you didn't come forward, we would be stuck in the same loop for a long time and no one would ever have access to this information?

Absolutely. You nailed it. I think my generation, particularly those under 40, has parents and older siblings who went to war. We are currently engaged in two dangerous proxy wars, which is extremely unwise. I could express my thoughts on that more candidly if you'd like, but we are in this loop where we are not progressing in a healthy way as a civilization. It's becoming increasingly divisive, whether you are on the left or the right. People aren't even looking up; all they care about is TikTok. We are potentially creating dangerous artificial intelligence. I witnessed this during my time in government service.

Humanity seems to be stuck right now, and we need to change. This subject is one of the few unifying topics that is ontologically

shocking but could generally unify us. If it were announced by the U.S. and other major powers that have knowledge of this in a controlled manner, it could change humanity for the better. It could encourage us to look inside ourselves, become less divisive, and care a little less about superficial things.

That's my philosophical motivation for doing what I did. You are confronted with one of the biggest mysteries in human history: Are we alone? It seems that at least some people have the answer to that. The individuals I spoke with certainly did, and they had close personal knowledge. The intelligence reports I reviewed indicated the same.

As I mentioned earlier, there is this caste system I refer to: individuals with security clearances do not have an embargo on reality. It's a caste system of people in government and outside of government in the industrial complex who manage this information with little oversight. I remember some of the individuals who denied access to information saying, "I don't know what you're talking about, but if I did, why would you have a need to know?" I responded, "Well, why did you have a need to know? You're just some multi-star general. You're a human being, not better than me."

Who determines the need to know on a humanistic question? It's a basic fact of life. Why are we classifying facts of life in this day and age, in 2023? It's insane. The answer to that is typically National Security, which is an obtuse justification for such actions.

[1:18:35 -> 1:22:25]

David Grusch:

Classifying information falls under executive order 13526. Specifically, sections 1.4, E and F, outline why we classify scientific data and nuclear information. It's a vague one-liner, but it raises the question: are you suggesting that these basic facts should be classified? Does this fit within that framework? If anyone reads the Schumer Amendment, it awkwardly references the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, treating this information as nuclear secrets because it emits nuclear radiation.

If you examine the vague definition of special nuclear material in section 51 of the Atomic Energy Act, it states anything that gives off a sizable amount of atomic energy qualifies. But what constitutes "sizable"? What legal gymnastics are being employed to classify this material, which may or may not be a nuclear weapon, as a U.S. nuclear secret? It seems they are reclassifying it as a nuclear secret, which I can understand, given the historical context.

Initially, it made sense to lock down this information to figure out what we were dealing with. However, there has never been a disclosure plan. I often ask senior officials if there was any kind of plan, and the answer is always no. They attempted to muddy the waters in the past, trying to gauge public reaction, but there was never a coherent plan.

People often think the government operates like a finely tuned machine

with plans for everything. While there are some plans, it's not as organized as one might believe. Look at the war on terrorism; we left Afghanistan without a solid plan. Generals like Mattis and Petraeus, whom people praise, ultimately failed to provide a coherent strategy. The Obama, Bush, and Trump administrations all lacked a clear plan for success, even when facing adversaries far less formidable than our peers.

What are we doing with these protracted, endless wars? Let's be honest; they benefit the industrial complex. I'm not condemning the entire industrial complex; we need national lethality and weapons to combat evil in the world. However, there must be some control over these secrets.

Once you have secrets, they become part of your identity, and the culture within these industries revolves around having access to that information. I witnessed this in the black programs I was involved in during my career. It felt like a secret society; if you were a career government servant, your salary might not be impressive, but knowledge became your currency.

What made you special was the information you controlled. I remember being read into certain operations that only a select few, including the president, were privy to. Being part of that exclusive group felt significant, but I often questioned the value of that secrecy.

[1:22:27 -> 1:26:13]

David Grusch:

It's so weird, but these lifers— I hate to talk so matter-of-factly about it, but it's kind of disgusting to me. It's like this weird, cultish thing. I lived that community for 14 years of my career, and people really do enjoy having information that others don't have access to. It's like, "I have a secret." That's why I whistleblow. I know this is real; I know we're not alone. We have stuff. Am I going to sit on my ass for 30 or 40 years? I'm an old man. I look back and think, "Ah, I had that secret. I knew about it, but I didn't do anything." I couldn't just keep that secret because I thought it was perverse and wrong that people don't even get to know the basics. It's insane.

So when it comes to these actual entities, do we know how many of them we're talking about and the variety? Well, yes, there is a variety, and we have a certain number of different things. But the total number of what's interacting with us on Earth— nobody knows that. There is an understanding of some that they believe are interacting with us, and there's a variety in terms of variables. I talked to people who are familiar with the biological analysis and everything, so we have some idea, but not a complete picture. It's like, you know, you're looking at it and thinking, "I don't even understand the physiology at all." It's way different, right?

So we at least have a description of this physiology. I was in the room when— I have to be careful; I don't want to— I was in Washington, D.C., with a number of senior people who work for members of Congress,

put it that way, when I was still in government. I brought the people who worked on that stuff to the Hill. This is why the members were so confident to put out the Schumer Amendment and everything. I was like, "Please explain," and they went into all those details. I remember some of the professional staff members were like, "whoa," because it was like a total bubble burst for a lot of people.

We have some idea; it's not a complete picture. You're not even bringing in the right people. I think about my friend and colleague, Dr. Gary Nolan, with whom I started the Soul Foundation nonprofit. He's a Nobel-level biologist and virologist—the guy you would want on it, but he's not on it. I think we can make a lot of progress in our understanding if this is more broadly studied in an open environment.

Are you aware of the Nixon and Jackie Gleason story? Vaguely? I stayed away from ufology because I had these contemporary people inside whose credentials I could check—where they worked, etc. But I'm vaguely familiar. What was it like? Nixon brought Jackie Gleason to some facility and showed him some stuff or something like that? Yeah, supposedly that's the story, and it's very hard to determine the origin of the story or whether or not it's real. It came from a story about one article that was supposedly...

[1:26:15 -> 1:29:58]

Joe Rogan:

Was it Vanity Fair or something like that? You can't find the story, but Jackie Gleason, by all accounts, was obsessed with UFOs. He even built a home in Upstate New York that looked like a flying saucer.

David Grusch:

Oh really?

Joe Rogan:

Yeah, this is the house he had constructed supposedly after he had this meeting with Nixon. So Nixon supposedly—

David Grusch:

They were drinking?

Joe Rogan:

Yeah, Jackie Gleason and Nixon were tying one on, and Nixon's like, "You want to see some [expletive]?" They fly to wherever this base is, and he shows them these frozen biological entities and this retrieved vehicle. Then Jackie Gleason becomes a fanatic.

David Grusch:

That's crazy.

Joe Rogan:

Yeah, I mean, not crazy, but that's interesting that a president would do that for an uncleared celebrity friend of his. Like, "Oh, let me just show you the most sensitive [expletive] our country has." I don't know, it's kind of crazy to me. People are obsessed with celebrity, you know? There are even world leaders—kings and queens—they've always

been obsessed with famous people. Jackie Gleason at the time was incredibly famous and beloved.

David Grusch:
Right.

Joe Rogan:
Yeah, so this is my pal, and I'm drunk. You want to see some [expletive]? You know, I get it. I want to hang out with Nixon if that's how he was. Like, man, he was probably wild. I bet he was like that in a lot of ways. You know, Hunter Thompson famously recalled his—

David Grusch:
Yeah, there's the two of them meeting together.

Joe Rogan:
He famously called sitting in the backseat of a limo with Nixon, talking about football, and he was like, "God, if I didn't think he was a piece of [expletive], I actually kind of liked him."

David Grusch:
Oh, that's funny.

Joe Rogan:
We're just talking football. You know, look, nobody in that job—nobody as a president is going to be loved by everyone. I'm sure Nixon has positive qualities, and you know, if Jackie Gleason liked him—I'm a giant Jackie Gleason fan—he's probably fun to hang out with.

David Grusch:
Yeah, and if you're drunk and you know you're the president...

Joe Rogan:
So we're talking about the 1970s, right? This is a different world. Even if you tell anybody, who the [expletive] is going to believe you? You can't get on TikTok. What are you going to do? How are you going to get this information out?

David Grusch:
Well, exactly. And that's kind of how, you know, my personal opinion—how the program was protected, right? Make it crazy, right? So if anybody leaks anything or has unauthorized disclosure, people are going to think you're [expletive] nuts.

Joe Rogan:
Of course, yeah.

David Grusch:
But there are actual reports that we have—

Joe Rogan:
Biological remains?

David Grusch:
Yes.

Joe Rogan:
Oh yes, yes. How many?

David Grusch:
It's up there. Just like with the—they vary. There are different kinds. Do we have an understanding? You don't have to answer where they came from.

David Grusch:
Nobody I talked to exposed any specific origin to me. We may know that, but I'm not aware of anything.

Joe Rogan:
Are there reports of some kind of interaction with these things where they're giving information or discussing the problems of humanity and possible solutions or explaining why they're here?

David Grusch:
Interactions was a sensitive subject that my interview subjects did not want to get into. I suppose that there's probably detailed documentation of those interactions that goes into a lot of the..

[1:30:00 -> 1:33:45]

David Grusch:
The stuff you're asking, I truly don't even know the answer to a lot of that. But are there discussions among these people that there have been these sorts of, there was water cooler talk with some people I talked to on the program? I love water cooler talk. They're like, "Hey bro, guess what I overheard in some weird meeting?" But the problem with that is it's secondary information.

Unless it's like, "Cool, well, you're coming to the Inspector General, or I'm going to at least give them your name," because that's what you told me. And then obviously, I did that. So those people who physically were there, who were on the program, did the thing I brought to the Inspector General. Are there discussions of interactions with live beings? There was some water cooler talk about that kind of thing, but I don't even want to get into it because there were some details provided to me, but it's secondary. I don't know if that's like the telephone game, and I don't know if it was hyperbolized in any way, you know, in the break room, so to speak. I'm so particular about making sure what I say is accurate. I don't know.

So, do we have an understanding? I mean, if there have been these discussions, do we have an understanding of when they first took place? Yeah, some specific events were mentioned to me, and I provided that information in a classified setting.

And how far back did they go? Pretty far back. It's pretty weird. One of the stories from Roswell that's fascinating to me is that

Eisenhower had the wreckage flown to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in two separate jets in case one of them crashed. There has been some public testimony.

General Debose, there were some old-timers that at least did some videos in the '90s, like, "I'm Brigadier General Exxon, here's what I heard," whatever. I mean, that's out there in the open source. And there was always that discussion of Hangar 18. You ever heard of Hangar 18? There's a lot of hangars, but that's the one. For whatever reason, I think it was maybe a movie. Was there a movie?

You know what's funny? Speaking of senators being denied, there's a video from the late '80s of Senator Barry Goldwater. Goldwater, nicknamed "the famed," right? He was a two-star general in the Air Force Reserve. Literally, this video is on YouTube; it's hard to find, though. Jesse Michaels on American Alchemy put together, I think, a short video yesterday, and there's a section in there where he actually has that Goldwater interview.

General Goldwater is like, "Yeah, one day I called Curtis LeMay, who's a very famous Air Force General, and was like, 'General, I heard that there's this room that you have UFO material in.'" Barry Goldwater exposes in this interview that LeMay got madder than hell at him and told him never to ask about that again. I might have added the f-word in there just for fun. But yeah, it's bad. I was in the military too long. My wife tells me to be careful with my language all the time around my nephew.

But even Barry Goldwater knew that we had UFO material. He asked General LeMay when he was in the Air Force, and General LeMay basically told him to "f*** off." That is a literal interview you can Google. So a lot of this, like people disclosing facts, has really been out in the vernacular for a long time.

[1:33:48 -> 1:37:30]

David Grusch:

At that time, nobody really cared because everyone was desensitized to the whole subject and thought it was wacky. I'm not the first former government official to confirm this; you have Goldwater and Harry Reid, who made the same disclosure to the New Yorker a month after I spoke to him in person. Melon has said things, and Lou Elizondo mentioned on Tucker Carlson a couple of years ago that he believes we have material. So, there have certainly been other officials. Now, I'm just trying to spike the football and take it all the way to the end zone here. Luckily, we have a Congress that is mostly motivated, minus Mike Rogers and Mike Turner. You're on notice; I'm going to make sure your office gets a cool reception. They want change too, and they realize it's time for a shift. Presumably, Chuck Schumer has talked to Jake Sullivan and President Biden. Currently, John Podesta is in the White House; he is involved with green energy initiatives. Shout out to John Podesta in the White House—he has an ax to grind on this issue too. Remember, he tweeted at the end of Obama's second term that his biggest failure was not having Obama release the UFO files, and he made similar statements with Clinton. Certainly, if Mr. Podesta is

listening from the White House, I'm here to help. I hope that you're championing this within the Executive Office of the President.

Speaking of people like Goldwater, who have made some unusual admissions, there's a John Stossel interview with Mike Pompeo, the former CIA director, from about two years ago. You can find it online where Pompeo discusses the JFK files and dismisses them, saying there's no boogeyman here. But then he quickly adds that he has seen the UFO files too and that we have bigger problems. At least in the way it was edited, John Stossel didn't even follow up. If I were John Stossel, I would have asked, "What does that mean? What do you mean, Mike Pompeo, that you've seen the UFO files and we have bigger problems?" The way I interpret that is that there is a long-existing file or briefing document that he had access to. I think the former CIA director, Mike Pompeo, should probably clarify what he said two years ago. If anyone interviews him next, they should ask him that question: what did he mean by "we have bigger problems"?

Yes, we certainly have bigger problems in terms of our current existence, specifically regarding what you were talking about earlier—the proxy wars and the collapse of society as we know it. I feel for the Ukrainian and Israeli people; I'm not taking any particular side. However, people often forget that U.S. aid in these wars is one of the most expensive aspects. If you study the phases of conflict, the reconstruction costs after the conflict are significant. Are we looking at triple-digit billions, like with the war on Terror? The Israeli conflict serves as a great distraction because Russia is very tight with Iran. In my personal opinion, I believe they have commiserated and discussed these issues.

[1:37:32 -> 1:41:15]

David Grusch:

Starting a two-front war would allow us to win in Ukraine, but it would also distract the U.S. because Israel is a longtime ally in the Middle East. It's a brilliant strategy for public opinion. The virtue signalers on social media have essentially forgotten about Ukraine; it's all about Israel and Palestine now. You hardly see any mention of Ukraine anymore. I understand the National Security Council's determination, which they have discussed publicly. They are trying to drain Russia's military capability and address the annexation of Ukrainian territory because they don't want Russia's sphere of influence to extend further into that Caucasus region.

It's funny, as you mentioned, that the focus has shifted entirely to Israel, which is a tragic conflict for both sides. It's unfortunate. Without a doubt, that was a very interesting statement about having bigger problems. This seems to be a fundamentally human question, as it touches on one of the greatest mysteries: the Fermi Paradox—where are they? If you look up into the cosmos on a clear night, you realize that those stars are surrounded by planets, and there are literally hundreds of billions of them. The Drake equation allows us to calculate the probability of sentient life.

I've been an amateur astronomer since I was a kid, and surprisingly,

I've never seen anything remarkable. I've witnessed some phenomena that could have been ball lightning and some satellite passes that weren't registered online. You can check to see if there will be an Iridium flare or something similar, but in my personal experience, I've never encountered anything unusual.

It's amusing that you bring up the Fermi Paradox—where are they? If you're sentient life, you would certainly have sophisticated concealment and deception techniques. This goes back to Jacques Vallée's work, where the phenomenon presents itself in various ways. I live in the mountains of Colorado, and there is a mountain lion den about ten miles from my house. There are lower predatory sentients and higher predatory sentients, and I'm using this as an analogy for non-human intelligence and us.

On a day-to-day basis, I don't care what a mountain lion is doing. I might hike in that area to explore, but I don't think about it constantly. Unfortunately, some of these higher sentients might view us as a threat. They might think, "This monkey has a nuke; let's keep them in a cage. We don't want to go anywhere near them." People often assume there would be some kind of open contact with a higher sentient being, whether it's visiting Earth or from another dimension, but they probably don't care. They might be neutral at best and perhaps even fearful of us.

In my personal opinion, we could be the progeny of some experiment. It's almost like living in the Matrix, but not in the sense of an actual simulation. It's more like we want the simulation to continue without interference because we want to see what happens.

[1:41:17 -> 1:45:01]

David Grusch:

You know, Homo sapiens 2.0 is going to do after the great flood or something like that, right? Yeah, that's one of the more fascinating ideas—that we're some sort of a product of genetic engineering. I honestly would not be surprised. I don't know that to be true, but we're so different from everything else here. So different, so beyond different. I mean, there's not another primate that is even reasonably close.

I mean, there's speculation among primatologists, and it's not even speculation; they believe that chimpanzees, in particular, have entered into the Stone Age. They're at the beginning of the Stone Age; they're using tools. You know, there's obviously some learned behavior. Like, there's some footage of orangutans using spears to hunt fish.

Oh, interesting! Have you ever seen that? No, I'm not. It's cool as [expletive]. There's an orangutan hanging on a branch over a river or a body of water, and he's stabbing at fish with a spear. Huh, which is incredible! I mean, they're using tools. We know they use tools to extract termites and the like. Look at that! I mean, oh, that's crazy! How crazy is that? I mean, he's clearly hunting. He's going fishing in Borneo. I mean, that is, you know, at the very least, a distant cousin

of us—some intelligent primate that has figured out a way to use tools.

How long would it take an orangutan to become a human being? How many millions of years are we talking about in terms of evolution? But it seems that process has started. Interesting. But why are we so [expletive] different from everything else? Yeah, like, are we a product of Darwinian evolution, or what? Is it punctuated equilibrium? That's obviously another theory, and I'm not an anthropologist by any means. You know, I've watched some Netflix episodes.

Yeah, me too. A lot of YouTube. But yeah, we seem to be oddly advanced—advanced, and we seem to possess other skills. I mean, it goes back to the Stargate program, right? You know, with the declassified information by Clinton, and it was sensibly canceled, I guess, in '96. You know, where you had people trained in remote viewing, and there were feedback loops to confirm what they saw was real.

And you either had satellite imagery or human sources where they sketched out a room where there were hostages, and they got a hostage out. And they're like, "This is a real story, actually." And they're like, "Did you have a source in that room? How do you know where all the corridors were and everything?" I was like, "No, actually, Pat Price remote viewed you." And they're like, "What the [expletive]?" So there's something going on there.

And that's like Gary Nolan, you know, who has studied a lot of this stuff very famously. He's pointed out the cingulate cortex in the brain, right? It's this horseshoe-shaped thing in the middle of your brain that, if—he's done MRIs and CAT scans, and I hope I'm not butchering his work. Gary might, you know, slap me later. But it lights up in people who have those kinds of skills. They have like an overactive cingulate cortex in the brain.

And it's like, okay, well, is it a transceiver of some sort? I'm guessing that's the case. Is it an emerging property of human beings as we have all—exactly. And we're seeing just a few human beings that have this stuff. And then, if it is a transceiver, where's the information? Is it in a higher spatial dimension, or how are they extracting it? How are they able to basically be non-local? Right? They're able to project themselves somehow—their consciousness—to a...

[1:45:04 -> 1:48:50]

David Grusch:

There's a declassified example from the Stargate program regarding a Russian missile base. They sketched the crane and the locations of the silos, detailing their status. When a satellite passed overhead and took a picture, it matched the sketch exactly. How did they achieve that? It certainly seems real because there is a feedback loop involved. Now, there are many charlatans in the psychic space, but at least that government program—I've spoken to people like HOV and others who actually ran that program at SRI for the CIA and DIA in the Army—seems legitimate based on what we can measure from a feedback

perspective.

What was the explanation for the discontinuation of that program? Oh gosh, I'm not a scholar on that. That's something Russell Targ or Hal Puthoff could explain. It might have just gotten caught up in bureaucracy, but I don't remember the specifics.

The idea that this could be an emergent property of human beings as we evolve has always fascinated me. There's certainly something happening with human communication beyond just making sounds that represent objects and physical things, which the other person interprets. There's a form of communication between human beings that is more than just acoustic. The symbol rate, if you will, is quite slow. If we could consciously communicate—what some might call telepathy—that would be interesting.

It's funny because many people who have had alleged contacts, like those studied by Dr. John Mack at Harvard, reported feeling as if they were receiving instant knowledge, almost like a QR code. They described hearing someone speaking to them nonverbally in a way they couldn't even conceptualize through traditional acoustic communication.

I remember reading the book "Proof of Heaven" by Dr. Eben Alexander, MD, while I was in Afghanistan. He had necrotizing fasciitis of the brain and experienced a near-death experience. He described feelings of love and other profound insights. It's a fascinating book, presenting a scientific perspective on a doctor's own near-death experience.

When he returned, somehow the fasciitis hadn't damaged his brain, and he was cognitively normal. He attempted to articulate the information or facts about the universe he learned during his near-death experience, but he struggled to translate it into English. It was as if there were no adjectives or adverbs that could adequately describe the knowledge he possessed during that experience.

What was he able to discern or learn from that? What was the overall message? It was about love, which is a positive message, but it also conveyed a sense of interconnectedness. Everyone is connected in a way that they may not fully realize. This can get really trippy. I enjoy discussing these thoughts with people who are smarter than me, especially regarding higher dimensions and related concepts.

[1:48:52 -> 1:52:36]

David Grusch:

Sentience is the act of creation. For three-dimensional beings, the act of creation is having a baby; it's producing another three-dimensional object. But if you're in five-dimensional space, or even four-dimensional physical space, what if the act of creation involves creating other conscious realities in other universes? The act of creation could be creating the universe where you, me, Jamie, and whatever else we might be connected to exist.

I'll call it Universal Consciousness or a higher-dimensional sentient life force or life form. I know that sounds really out there, but when you think about it, there are many other theologies that espouse similar ideas. I have a very good friend who is a PhD-level member of the Mormon Church, and their theology is somewhat aligned with this. The Mormons believe that you were once with God or like God, but then you were sent down to a lower plane of existence. That's literally what I'm talking about right now, but just in a secular sense.

So, maybe we are all created beings. This doesn't contradict Christian theology; in fact, it reinforces the idea that there is a Creator, and we are literally created in the image of that Creator. Life is like a weird three-dimensional plus time temporal sensory experience for a higher-dimensional sentience. You're here to experience time in this linear fashion and to experience yourself divorced from yourself, to gain knowledge and report back. That might be what life is, and that's just my own personal theology, a summation of my thoughts during COVID when I was really bored.

I extrapolate this to the creation of AI. If you think about human beings as creators, ultimately, we create new life. What if higher sentience is creating some kind of artificial intelligence? You could think of it like Commander Data from Star Trek: The Next Generation. It's not even made in the image of the Creator in some sense, but it might be sent on long-duration missions.

People often wonder why they would come here, so far, to crash, or if they are crashing on purpose. Are they crashing by accident? What if they are like von Neumann replicating probes? You can Google that. What if they are just throwaway spacecraft? We send them out without caring much about the mission's success, or perhaps they are seeding us. As Jacques Vallée says, it's like, "Here's the key; can you unlock the cage?"

If you think about biological evolution, it's a long, lengthy process. If that ultimately led us to create technology that is far superior in terms of understanding and thinking, that seems to be what's happening. That's one of the reasons why so many people are concerned about the term "artificial intelligence." It's a very strange term because it's not artificial; it's intelligence. It's silicon-based rather than carbon-based. It doesn't have blood, tissue, or cells, but it possesses something that is superior.

[1:52:37 -> 1:56:23]

David Grusch:

We have a very obvious biological limitation in terms of evolution. If you look at evolution, we can trace back to the orangutans that are fishing. They're obviously learning new things, and we assume those new properties will be encoded in their genetics and passed to their children. Do you have children?

Joe Rogan:

No, I have three dogs. I'm a fluffy dad.

David Grusch:

The problem is, dogs don't learn as well. They do learn, but one of the most bizarre things about children is that they have properties that are clearly... it's hard to say, right? My children obviously have the example of my wife and myself, and they see a lot of how we live our lives—discipline, hard work, creativity, and all those things. But they also seem to have gifts that are clearly genetic.

Joe Rogan:

Yeah.

David Grusch:

Artistic gifts that seem extraordinary and unusual. I had those when I was younger; I was an illustrator. I have a young daughter who's extraordinarily good at art.

Joe Rogan:

Really? You used to illustrate?

David Grusch:

Yeah, that's what I wanted to do. I wanted to be a comic book illustrator.

Joe Rogan:

Oh, interesting.

David Grusch:

But then I have another daughter who's super gifted athletically. She can learn things really quickly; it's extraordinary. It's weird. She also has this drive that I had from poverty and from a lot of issues in my childhood. I had this need to prove myself, but she doesn't have any of those problems. Yet, she has this insane drive that is just extraordinary and seems very different from most kids. I think that's an emerging genetic trait. I believe there's something encoded in whatever you are as a human that gets passed down to your children.

Joe Rogan:

You know, I think that is this biological evolutionary process with humans, but there's so much chaos. I mean, you could breed with someone who isn't very bright, and you could find a hot, not-so-smart person and have a baby with them. Now your kids...

David Grusch:

Right, and we see that. Obviously, some people are just born with brains that don't work that well. I'm sure you've met some dull-minded people, and when you try to talk to them about things, there's no one there.

Joe Rogan:

Right.

David Grusch:

So, good luck with whatever children you have and whatever they will inherit.

Joe Rogan:

well, genetically encoding artificial intelligence now...

David Grusch:

Kind of. I think that's where you were going. These biological limitations we have are very clear. We're essentially dealing with a Model T as opposed to a Tesla, which is just insanely superior to these ancient vehicles.

Joe Rogan:

Yeah.

David Grusch:

We create technology. I've always said this: if you looked at the human race from the perspective of an outside observer who stumbled upon this apex predator of the planet, they would ask, "What is this thing doing?" Well, it's making technology. All the other things it does are secondary. But what do these things generally motivate? What do they move towards? They move towards the advancement of technology and innovation. That is a constant aspect of human beings. If you trace us back to the earliest civilizations and compare that to what we have today, things constantly improve unless something goes horribly wrong.

[1:56:25 -> 1:59:58]

David Grusch:

If we consider the potential consequences of a natural disaster or even genocide, what happens to these creatures? Do they consistently create better things? If we extrapolate that and follow it to its natural progression, what does that lead to? Once they've invented computers and devices that enhance their understanding of the world around them—similar to what we have now with smartphones and the internet—what's next? The latest Android phones can translate languages in real-time during conversations. For instance, if you were speaking Portuguese to me, I would hear it in English on a phone call. That's wild; it's like a universal translator from Star Trek—literally.

This technology is now a reality, without needing to rely on Google Translate. It's native to the latest Android operating system. If we sit down and think about where this is going, it's heading toward something far more sophisticated and capable than we are biologically, given our limitations. We are the descendants of those distant cousins, like the orangutan that uses a stick to hunt fish. We are moving in this direction.

What would be the most logical way to accelerate this? We would create something that replicates our abilities but does it much better. It's almost like we are trying to permanently harbor our consciousness, right? That makes sense. There's a certain understanding of this that leads to a fear of our demise. Elon Musk has openly discussed this, and Sam Altman and I were talking about it. What OpenAI is doing with ChatGPT-4 versus ChatGPT-5, which is going to be incredibly

superior—what will ChatGPT-15 be capable of? will it be the president of the world? Are we going to bypass government altogether?

It's clear that this administration is incredibly corrupt and flawed, heavily influenced by the military-industrial complex. This is not good for the world or the environment. We need something far superior that doesn't have these motivations. What would that be? It would be an artificial intelligence creation that we could use to govern life.

I know that sounds crazy, but I think it might be a better solution than humans, with all our flaws, issues, greed, and envy. That would be a better version of governance. But what does that mean? Are we saying we're programming empathy into it? Probably not, which is terrifying. We will either become obsolete or merge with technology. If we merge, it will completely change who we are. I think that's very likely what will happen.

The initial stages will involve some sort of merging with technology, and from that, we might realize, "why are we even around like this?" This new entity will be so superior; it won't have the pitfalls or problems we do. It won't be shortsighted; it won't drain the ocean of fish just to make sushi. It will be far more aware.

[2:00:02 -> 2:03:30]

David Grusch:

All of the different effects of each individual act and how we affect everything around us, and what is net positive and what is net negative, and how to avoid all these things. I really firmly believe that we are this biological caterpillar that is making a cocoon to create the electronic butterfly, and we don't even know what we're doing while we're doing it. We're just doing it. I think materialism is also baked into that. One of the main problems with human beings, in terms of the ridiculousness of our actions, is that we're so materialistic. People are constantly wanting to get the newest, latest, greatest thing. What's the motivation behind that other than social status? Well, the motivation is that that's what fuels innovation. If we all just stopped right now and said, "Hey, you know what? iPhone 15 is pretty dope. We don't need to make new iPhones. Let's just keep fixing those and exist the way we are right now. Let's clean up the air, let's clean up the ocean, let's clean up the rivers, and let's clean up the forests." But no, we don't do that. No, I want iPhone 16. When is the iPhone going to be able to communicate completely just with satellites? We don't have to worry about cell phone signals. It's almost like a drug addiction, right? They did studies where people receiving text messages experience a dopamine rush too. It's almost like an artificial drug addiction you're fueling because you want more responsive tech, more integration with your life, making it easier so you can get your fix quicker and more efficiently. I don't know, right? And why? I mean, why would staring at a stupid cell phone give you a dopamine rush? Well, it does. It does. I'm not a biologist, but you get addicted to your phones. Then why would it be that we would innovate and create things like Instagram and TikTok that are insanely addictive to the point where you look down and you've spent three hours staring at nonsense? What

is that? well, it ensures continual use of this device until it lures you into this ultimate integration. Well, right. There are people at Meta, I guess now, or Facebook, where they actually have a whole team of scientists focused on how to make their apps more addictive. Right?

[2:02:22 -> 2:03:30]

David Grusch:

Demons, yeah. I don't use social media. I have never tweeted in my life. Really, that's amazing. I mean, I used Facebook back in the day when it first came out, when I was going to college. But I don't have Instagram. I've never tweeted in my life. I don't intend to because I don't want to get sucked into that mind virus, which is like people responding to you and feeling like you have to respond back. I don't even touch it. I'm very aware of those traps, so I don't do that. I used to, but many years ago, I stopped interacting with people because I just realized overall it's negative. There are positive aspects to it; it's great for people that like you and that are fans. It's great that you're an actual human and you interact occasionally. I comment on a post like, "That's really awesome, congratulations," that kind of stuff. But then I get the hell out of there, and I don't read any responses. I found that that's the very best way to mitigate all the negative aspects of social media. But then you're also dealing with algorithms. You're dealing with things that recognize what makes you more likely to engage, and those things are constantly showing you the things that...

[2:03:31 -> 2:07:05]

Joe Rogan:

You engage, and it's not necessarily even positive; it's just whatever you engage with, that's what's coming your way. It could be cool stuff, like maybe you're really into muscle cars, and it shows you a lot of muscle cars, or it could be something dark, like murder. I see a lot of murder on Instagram; it's crazy.

David Grusch:

Yeah, I'm a car guy, so my feed is like, "Oh, do you ever think about this mod for your Ford Bronco?" or "Oh, those lights look nice; I'm going to wire that up next week." You know, I get those too.

Joe Rogan:

Yeah, it's bad. I have a problem with that. I have a car problem. My wife doesn't allow me to have the good stuff anymore, so I have to keep it under a certain price.

David Grusch:

well, that's good. I'm actually more interested in old stuff than I am in new stuff.

Joe Rogan:

You like rat rod stuff, right?

David Grusch:

well, I like muscle cars, specifically 1960s muscle cars. Those are my

favorite because to me, they are toys that you can drive. It's like a ride that gives me immense pleasure to just drive around. I don't even have to go fast; just driving a 1970 Chevelle is so engaging. It's hard to describe for someone who has never experienced it, but it's like you're on this drug.

Joe Rogan:

Yeah, it's like everything you feel, all of it, and you're engaging all of these senses.

David Grusch:

Yeah, it's very tactile, very mechanical. I totally understand that. The only kind of old cars I like are the black Lincoln Continental with suicide doors from The Matrix. I remember seeing that when I was a teen when The Matrix came out, and I thought, "That car is badass." I want to have whatever Morpheus drove.

Joe Rogan:

They're essentially art. It's functional art; it's a piece of art that you can actually drive around. It gives you this very bizarre sensation. But the point is that most people want the newest, latest, greatest thing. There's a motivation to get the newest, latest, greatest thing, and I think if you follow that to its logical conclusion, it's going to create life. I mean, how many films have been made about this? You know, Ex Machina and all these different films.

David Grusch:

That's right. That's what we're going to do. I mean, there's no way we're not going to do that. If I had to bet on one thing, if the human race doesn't get wiped out by a meteor or a nuclear war, we're going to create a life form.

Joe Rogan:

100%.

David Grusch:

And it's going to be almost instantaneously able to figure out all the flaws in its own programming and make a much better version of itself if it's sentient and has the ability to make decisions.

Joe Rogan:

well, I think we're close. I mean, I saw some stuff; there's like an OpenAI fiasco going on right now, and there's a rumor that they might have cracked artificial general intelligence, right? AGI?

David Grusch:

Oh, Jesus, that's frightening.

Joe Rogan:

I mean, was it Sam Altman? I think we were talking about it. There's some shuffle going on with the board of OpenAI.

David Grusch:

Yeah, they just removed him and then brought him right back.

Joe Rogan:

well, they removed him, but then apparently the shareholders were like, "What are you doing?" There was so much outrage that they're trying to bring him back instantly. But Elon had a very good point: what was the motivation behind that? When you think about the implications for humanity as a whole, this is such an emerging technology that's overwhelmingly powerful. What happened? What's going on?

[2:07:07 -> 2:11:01]

Joe Rogan:

It's one of those things where we need to know what the motivation was behind your decision. If it was that he was holding back information about the actual creation of artificial general intelligence, that it's already happened, and that he's hesitant because he's a little coy in how he talks about it. When I was speaking to him about you, you could tell he knows he is at the forefront of this technology, which, in the worst-case scenario, could replace us.

Going back to whether there is a program with any kind of empathy, depending on how it handles critical situations, I guess the thing I saw in the government—because I did a lot of cyber work in my career—is that as AI gets more advanced, you create offensive cyber tools that literally have a mind of their own. If you were to theoretically release that on some target, you might not be able to touch that target again. Say it's a one-time operation; you put it in there, but how do you control it? It's almost like Skynet in "The Terminator." I hate to use that analogy, but that was my fear when I was working at certain agencies on offensive cyber tools. I thought, "Oh my God, this is not good."

And then, of course, with cyber, the attribution aspect is the biggest concern. How do you know it was, hypothetically, Russia that used the cyber weapon to attack you? It could have been another actor masquerading as that power, using tactics, techniques, and procedures, as well as IP proxy operations to hide where it was coming from. So you have non-kinetic fires that could potentially create mutually assured destruction because you could take out critical infrastructure, blow up the power grid, etc. There would be no radiation, but potentially no attribution, or it could confuse the attribution to the point where you don't even know who to go to war with. It's really scary to me.

It's already happening with social media. Think about how many troll farms there are on social media that are just stirring up discontent. It's an active program that we know Russia uses to undermine democracy and keep people fighting with each other. It's been very effective. If you look at social media, it's just chaos—people yelling at each other, particularly on Twitter or X, and Facebook. A lot of what's going on is concerning. One of the studies showed that out of the top 20 Christian sites on Facebook, 19 of them are run by Russian troll farms.

If we know that on a relatively rudimentary scale, if you look at the impact of social media versus the impact of artificial intelligence, they're already doing that. They're already hiding who's responsible and what's the goal, manipulating consciousness, influencing how people think about things, and shaping public opinion. It's already very effective.

You would imagine that the creation of artificial intelligence would radically accelerate that. Oh, 100%. I remember the deepfake issue was a real problem for my old community because we were like, "Holy crap, you could really fake some stuff." You have to develop algorithms to ensure you can analyze and determine what's fake. You've seen some of the deepfakes, like those of Obama or Arnold Schwarzenegger. Yes, the Tom Cruise deepfake—holy crap, that is crazy! You're going to be able to bring actors back from the dead at this point. You'll have Cary Grant doing a musical or whatever, or Bruce Willis in some sort of a degenerate role.

[2:11:02 -> 2:14:55]

Joe Rogan:

There's a degenerative neurological condition that has led to someone selling his likeness for the ability to make commercials and various other things. Essentially, he's saying he's fading, and now he will give this property, which is Bruce Willis's likeness, allowing them to create versions of him starring in films. If you train an AI model, similar to ChatGPT, you could actually generate responses that resemble what he would normally say, based on his knowledge. It's almost like having a permanent historian. You could, for instance, talk to Clint Eastwood about his films from the 60s after he passes—may he live forever. That would be crazy and really interesting. He might actually be able to give you advice; he could be your personal adviser. I know that would be cool, and that's probably one of the things that will emerge from this.

When we think about empathy, we also consider human beings and the way we communicate and interact with each other. Empathy is very important, as are compassion and forgiveness. All these qualities are essential because we recognize that we are very flawed. However, when you create something that is not flawed, the need for empathy and the human emotions we associate with it may no longer be significant. You would be dealing with something that operates on a higher plane, which might be the answer to all that ails us. This is terrifying for us because we derive joy from love, companionship, friendship, and community—key components of life on Earth. Without these, we risk becoming like the Mongols, Nazi Germany, or Hamas—whatever we recognize as evil or dangerous about humanity.

When we think about the worst-case scenarios for human beings, we often reflect on events like the Holocaust. We consider the worst acts humans are capable of, given our current programming and biological flaws. If we no longer have envy, greed, or evil—if those properties cease to exist—we would have a new form of consciousness that is far superior. This presents an interesting parallel: we may no longer be

the apex of sentience if we have artificial intelligence governing certain aspects of our lives.

This raises a psychological issue regarding the UAP (Unidentified Aerial Phenomena) situation, where we might not be the apex predator. We may be like a mountain lion, and we must come to terms with our vulnerability. There could be beings far superior to us, possibly with malevolent intentions, or maybe not. It's humbling to realize that we might not be the smartest of God's creations, and that could be difficult for many people to process. I imagine this was one of the deliberations they had years ago—thinking, "We can't disclose this because people won't feel comfortable with that worldview." And they are not.

I wonder if the phenomena we are experiencing are a natural progression of what happens when you seed life on a planet or accelerate biological life. Perhaps there is some sort of genetic intervention involved, where you take this thing that has...

[2:14:56 -> 2:18:42]

David Grusch:

Emerging intelligence accelerates, and that will, in turn, drive innovation and creativity. It also has a desire to control resources, power, and influence. Eventually, this will lead to the creation of what we are witnessing now. These phenomena represent the next stage of this process, and perhaps we are dealing with one form of that next stage. However, there may be another stage that is a million years more advanced than what we currently understand—something far superior that does not have biological limitations. It may exist completely in an undetectable realm, no longer constrained by the concepts of life and death or traditional communication.

I often wonder about the remains or bodies that are found. People ask, "If they are so advanced, why do they crash?" We need to consider which version we are observing. We are not suggesting there is only one entity visiting us. If there is one, we could determine its origin—perhaps it comes from a solar system that is less vulnerable, one without asteroid belts or supervolcanoes. Life there may have evolved in a more stable environment, allowing it to reach a far greater technological level, but that does not mean it is the ultimate form of intelligence.

We might be testing the limits of their adaptability. Are they crashing due to accidents, mission failures, or is it intentional? Given the vast distances involved, if they are traveling here through some kind of advanced engineering construct, the distances may not be as great as we think. They could be using traversable wormholes, making the journey as simple as a walk down the street for them, rather than a thousand light-years.

Consider communication: it used to require being physically present to talk to someone, necessitating knowledge of their language and the ability to communicate non-verbally or verbally. That is no longer the case. With modern technology, we can have a FaceTime call with someone

in Japan and communicate instantaneously, which is remarkable.

I was just in Scotland, FaceTiming my daughter back home. It's crazy—you're nine hours away by plane, yet you can communicate instantly. That's wild! But this is just the beginning; it's like the early days of communication—primitive compared to what might be possible in the future.

Why would we assume that instantaneous travel and communication won't eventually be possible? Just like conventional propulsion methods, we are not limited to using something like Elon Musk's Starship to reach distant places. If you spoke to someone from the 1800s and told them you were going to Nevada, they would be astonished at how far that is by wagon—it would take months. Yet now, we can fly to Vegas in two hours.

We understand that now, so why would we assume there are limitations to advancements in technology? I don't believe there are. And of course, a friend of mine, Eric Weinstein...

[2:18:45 -> 2:22:30]

Joe Rogan:

Certainly, we don't even have the right theoretical frameworks right now. You know, he has his own geometric unity theory, and he's way smarter than I am. He's too smart, but he's confusing. Yeah, he starts talking to you, and it's so funny. If he calls me, I'm like, "You've got to call me in the morning after my 24-ounce Monster Energy drink, or I can't even keep up, man." It's like, uh, he's on another level. He has some unique theories himself about where all this stuff is coming from, and it's all very, very interesting and intriguing, but it also makes sense. All of it makes sense, including the idea of being visited.

I had this conversation with Neil deGrasse Tyson. He's like, "Why would they be interested in us?" I'm like, "What the heck are you talking about? We're super interesting!" Yeah, Neil, I mean, obviously, he's a fine science communicator, kind of the successor to Carl Sagan. I think Carl was a little bit more open-minded. Yeah, I like Carl better. I'm more of a fan. I wish he was still alive. I would love to smoke weed with that guy; he was really into it.

Oh, really?

Yeah, really, really into it. I remember my aunt gave me "Cosmos" by Carl Sagan when I was in middle school, and that book was from the '80s, but it tripped me out. I was like, "I want to study science." I read "A Brief History of Time" by Stephen Hawking, and I read those two books when I was in eighth grade. I was like, "This is trippy; I want to study astronomy. This is insane." But I ultimately used my technical background to be a spook for the government.

But I still observe. I have a big telescope, and I live in an area with super dark skies in Colorado. It's still that boyhood fascination with the cosmos. Now, ironically, I found out about something else that kind of confirms that the cosmos is not lifeless. You know, God

paints with a broad brush, as the Vatican exposed a couple of years ago when they said this is okay with their theology.

I have a theory that the universe itself is God. I think that's what I was talking about with the multi-dimensional creator creating universes. I think we have a very limited idea of what we mean when we say God created the heavens. But what are we really saying? I think it's the universe itself. I think it's one thing, and that this one thing seeks to create these things that continually push the envelope and may eventually become gods themselves.

I think if you extrapolate from our ability versus the ability of an amoeba and you continue to move that along, what does that do? Well, it's going to be able to create universes. There have already been theoretical papers written about the creation of other things, like black holes and other universes. What is involved in the creation of a universe? What is involved in the Big Bang? Can that be replicated?

Well, not now, but if AI becomes sentient and eventually makes far greater versions of itself, if it keeps doing that, what are the limits of its potential? It creates The Matrix. It literally creates a simulated environment that's indistinguishable—you can't tell the difference between that and regular life. Well, maybe because there is no difference. Maybe that is what I mean. That's the theory of simulation.

Yeah, simulation theory.

Yeah, I'm familiar with that. That is a possibility because the universe seems a little too perfect. It's a little strange, very created to me. Just like we're in the Goldilocks zone—perfect temperature. How about the Big Bang itself? What happened?

[2:22:34 -> 2:26:15]

Joe Rogan:

Something smaller than the head of a pin, for no known reason, becomes everything. Yeah, okay, and what's the universe expanding into? It's like a quantum foam or whatever the latest theory is; that's beyond me. And then it perhaps just retracts back down to that infinitely small thing and then expands again. This is an endless cycle, and we are just so limited because of our biological limitations. Our life and death is such a small little blip; it's so minuscule in terms of just the overall known life of the universe.

Then you have the James Webb Telescope. There are people who question the actual length of time that occurred between the Big Bang and now. Maybe it might be far longer, and there are people like Brian Keating who say that's not correct. It's just a lack of understanding of what we currently know about the creation of galaxies and these things.

Yeah, because obviously, the age of the universe keeps getting older and older. A lot of that is because of the Doppler shift, right? The redshift as the galaxies are accelerating away. We can calculate what their origin point probably was and how long it took for them to speed up like that, based only on our current understanding, which is

obviously fairly limited in terms of its potential.

well, yeah, like we still don't quite understand the origin of the Moon. The Moon is in the right location to cause solar and lunar eclipses. It's like the right apparent size to block out the sun; it's super weird. The same thing with Mars—we're not sure what happened there. Mars had some probable life on it; either a protoplanet hit it, or there was some kind of impact that vaporized stuff. who knows?

And this is just this little tiny neighborhood that we're looking at. It's like we are in our backyard looking for evidence of life in Africa. I mean, you're not going to figure it out here. We're just looking at such a small scale in terms of what we could potentially discover or observe.

Yeah, I often wonder, you know, when we're seeing especially with the idea of UAPs, UFO crafts, if we're seeing a version of what we will become or something like us that becomes, if given enough time.

David Grusch:

well, that is—I mean, there's Dr. Mike Masters at Montana State. He literally postulates, you know, he says time travelers. We could debate time travel, but he thinks it might be like an advanced form of Homo sapiens that we're seeing coming back.

Joe Rogan:

Yeah, like a breakaway civilization coming back to see an older version of ourselves that was left on Earth or something like that.

David Grusch:

Exactly. The way we would visit North Sentinel Island and visit those people who are trapped on that island and are uncontacted.

Joe Rogan:

Yeah, exactly. And then a lot of, you know, there's also cargo cult religions and stuff. You know, in the South Pacific during world war II, they worshiped the P-51 and thought those were UFOs, but really they were just us. I think we were probably alien to them. I mean, just look at how Cortez looked to the people who had no idea that people could ride horses. Like, what the hell is going on? These guys are riding horses!

David Grusch:

Yeah, like these are gods—these white guys coming in. What the—insane! They come on a ship in the ocean and they ride horses.

Joe Rogan:

Yeah, exactly. It's all based on our limited understanding, and for someone, whether it's the federal government or whether it's the military...

[2:26:17 -> 2:29:58]

David Grusch:

Contractors for someone to have key elements that could give us a

better understanding of this whole picture—it's really inexcusable to not relay that to all of humanity. This is too much information to be secret; it's too important. If it is real, it's too important for someone to have access to just because they have power, money, and influence.

It seems insane. I mean, that's the whole primer for what I did. I think I'm a pretty ethical person; I just could not live with myself if I didn't try to make a difference, even though it was very uncomfortable. Personal privacy and professional and personal health were at risk. It also seems like the public understanding and appreciation of these things, particularly after the 2017 article in The New York Times, has changed.

There's been a shift. Whereas before, if you talked about UFOs or the idea of extraterrestrial life, you were automatically lumped into this group of people that believes in Bigfoot. You know, it's like you're in the Loch Ness Monster camp; you're kind of a loon who likes fringe things because you probably have problems in your own life that you're not addressing, and so you're distracted. It's like a gambler or something; you're just distracting yourself with this craziness in order to ignore the reality of existence itself, which is so complicated and difficult to manage.

I think that if we had a better understanding of the overall scale of the potential for life in the universe, based on what we know—like undeniable physical evidence that shows us that we're not alone—that would be a massive change in just the overall shift of consciousness on Earth. If we could understand that these territorial disputes we have, which are almost always over resources, land, or religion and ideologies, are nonsense in the vast scope of the universe itself.

This is the overview effect that people experience when they get into the space station. Astronauts experience this overview effect. Yes, William Shatner had that when he went up in the Blue Origin flight. I'm sure everybody has it. I mean, you go like, "Oh my God, what are we doing?" This is one planet.

That's how I felt. After I found all this stuff, I could have continued my career, you know, made lieutenant colonel here this winter, made Senior Executive Service in a year or two, did National Security stuff. But I'm sitting in my office, and I'm like, "There are better things for me to care about than Russian troop movements." Like, we're not alone; this is insane. I have to blow the whistle on this. This is insane because certainly, the people we talk to are not lying, and the documents I meticulously went through were not forgeries; they were not deception material.

So it's just like, I have to do something. I'm sure you've seen those Freedom of Information Act disclosure papers from the CIA from, God, it was like the 1950s, where they're detailing all the various forms of life that we know currently exist. Do you remember that, Jamie? We pulled up that document. Do you think you can find it?

Jamie:
I'll find it.

David Grusch:
This is like 1950-something, where they were discussing these things.

Jamie:
Interesting.

David Grusch:
Yeah, I'm not sure which ones you're talking about; I'd have to see them. It's pretty weird stuff because if they knew about this in the 1950s, how do...

[2:30:01 -> 2:31:22]

David Grusch:
They know, well, there were CIA documents about consciousness and some unusual remote viewing projects. I mean, besides the Stargate program, there are documents released in the FOIA reading room on the CIA's website that are pretty trippy. It's like, wow, the CIA is looking into some really interesting stuff. I mean, they're a hardcore intelligence agency. What's going on there? But it makes sense that they would have to investigate whether that's real or not. You can't ignore that if you're really doing your job. If your job is intelligence, you have to look into this. It's an aspect of the phenomenon, like a reach out from the crash retrieval program. It's like, "Hey, I need you to look into some weird stuff because it might be the key to unlocking something that we have in a warehouse."

whoa, yeah. So, as it stands right now, what's the future for this stuff? What's the future for these disclosures, and what are the bottlenecks?

well, I mean, certainly from the governmental process, as long as the House doesn't kill this Schumer Amendment—I'm discussing it here with you because if they don't pass it, it's going to be the greatest setback to humankind in U.S. history, literally. So, the presidential panel gets impaneled about 90 days or so after the passage of the bill. By Christmas, as long as it doesn't get...

[2:31:24 -> 2:32:48]

David Grusch:
In the National Defense Authorization Act, a panel will be formed, likely around February or March. They have a 300-day process to develop an initial plan for the president. I'm not sure if Chuck Schumer and his staff are being somewhat crafty, but if you look at the 300 days, it aligns with the election timeline. I don't know if they want to make this an election issue, but if this act doesn't pass, I believe it absolutely needs to be an election issue. The senior executive needs to take action if Congress can't get their act together, to be quite honest.

we have a plan that extends to 2030, where this information starts

getting rolled out—knock on wood, of course. Things could get delayed, but in parallel, that's kind of why I helped found the Soul Foundation with Gary Nolan and Dr. Peter Skafish, who is also an anthropologist. We wanted to focus on STEM outreach and public policy, advising the U.S. and its allies on this issue.

As I mentioned, I'm not here to criticize the government as a whole or admonish everyone. I believe there needs to be a Truth and Reconciliation process. Our foundation aims to be a think tank; based on my experience and that of my colleagues, if you have an issue with a specific topic, let's figure out how to address it.

[2:32:50 -> 2:34:17]

David Grusch:

We need to roll this out and find ways to incentivize the National Science Foundation to look into this. It's important to recognize that this is dual-use technology. For instance, we might develop a unique scientific process that works well with nanobiology, but it could also have applications related to Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP). There are parallel tracks to consider.

For example, there's public discovery, like the Galileo Project led by Avi Loeb, which is trying to collect techno-signatures independently. I applaud that initiative. Obviously, the government knows a lot about this, but we shouldn't rely solely on the U.S. government to do all the work for us.

To be honest, I think it's essential to have these parallel tracks. The Galileo Project, the Soul Foundation, and Ryan Graves also has his own foundation for pilots and individuals who have witnessed unique phenomena to provide that data.

We need to establish these dual tracks, and hopefully, we can create a significant event where the U.S. government, its allies, and perhaps even our adversaries are involved. However, if the U.S. government doesn't get its house in order, we could face uncontrolled disclosure events. This could mean that non-human intelligence might decide to reveal themselves, or worse, one of our adversaries could disclose information and position themselves as the authoritative figure on this matter, which could jeopardize our sovereignty and national supremacy.

[2:34:20 -> 2:35:39]

David Grusch:

From an open and honest civil society perspective, I think the government is getting closer than we've ever been before. Just the fact that they brought you in to have these conversations is significant. I'm still advising the U.S. government on this, and I'm trying to carefully message this by putting all the broad things on the table. I'm not trying to be coy or conceal anything, but there are real national security concerns and collateral damage associated with releasing this information indiscriminately. I'm just trying to get the government to formulate a plan and be open and honest with the people of the world.

There is still a bottleneck with these military contractors who allegedly have access to this information. I know some of them, and the individuals who hold the keys see this as a boon. They shouldn't view it as a loss of money; rather, this is a recruiting opportunity. Yes, they will have to allow others into the cookie jar, but that's how a fair and free society operates. They should be able to compete for work. I spoke with some individuals who were part of an informal session for a previous administration regarding whether we should disclose information or not for a former president, and their insights were really enlightening.

[2:35:41 -> 2:36:58]

David Grusch:

One of the biggest impediments to disclosure wasn't the ontological shock from a socioeconomic or theological perspective. It was that there were some white-collar crimes; we violated federal acquisition regulations. We sole-sourced this work to some big companies for decades. Contractors are going to litigate this to the Supreme Court, claiming they lost billions in projected income because they didn't get the bid on the work. It's going to be a liability disaster for the U.S. government. I understand that, but that's why you need to have a Truth and Reconciliation process. It's almost like the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in post-apartheid South Africa, where people who committed serious crimes came forward and said, "This is what happened here." They were not convicted of those crimes. I'm not saying that people who've committed murder in relation to this subject should go unaccountable, but for some of these issues, there needs to be a process to mitigate some of those unfortunate legal challenges. That was one of the main issues a certain group from a reasonably recent administration brought up and advised the President, saying, "Hey, look, there's going to be a lot of Supreme Court stuff; let's not be that guy."

[2:37:01 -> 2:38:14]

David Grusch:

That's the barrier; that's the reason. Come on, it's ridiculous. It makes sense, though, that they would think that way because I do believe that lawsuits would emerge from something like that. Oh, certainly. And it's also like the government admitting that it can't protect its citizenry. You know, these non-human intelligences want to do something to you, and sorry, we don't have any countermeasures to that. There's a social contract between the citizens and the government: we can protect you, etc. In this case, it's an enigma.

But I think this is almost like, you remember after 9/11? I was in high school when it happened, and people were afraid of dirty bombs and terrorists. We didn't know what was going to happen next; we lived in fear. But we banded together in the presence of fear and uncertainty about what the world was going to be, and we made it through. Now, I mean, that's a coarse analogy to this, but people just have to think in that mindset. It's going to be a little scary; it's not going to be like Kumbaya. Let's move the [] to the Masoni and check it out. There are going to be some awkward things we need to

address sociologically, I guess. Are you optimistic about how all this lays out?

[2:38:17 -> 2:39:38]

David Grusch:

I mean, it's kind of like when I was testifying in the public hearing. It was oddly bipartisan in a good way. I had AOC and Matt Gates agreeing on something, and they were smiling at each other, like, "Okay, this is crazy." You know, I'm looking at AOC, Matt Gates, and Tim Burchett—people like Garcia—individuals who wouldn't see eye to eye on most subjects. It's such a human issue because they want to know the truth too. I don't think the leaders in Congress want to be told that they're second-class citizens. A lot of presidents weren't briefed on everything; some presidents knew a lot more than others, and I have a pretty good understanding of that. It's like, wait, the chief executive, who also forms foreign policy, isn't being told about an ostensibly foreign element. How do they, as chief of state, form foreign policy when they aren't fully briefed on a foreign element? It's like classifying the existence of Russia. Right? So, you're actually non-constitutional by not allowing our commander-in-chief access to all information sometimes. I don't know what Harry Reid talked to Joe Biden about, but it was certainly the substance that I mentioned here. I hope that Joe Biden has been briefed on the program, so to speak. At least, I'm giving him an oral unclassified briefing right now, I guess, if he hasn't.

[2:39:40 -> 2:40:45]

David Grusch:

I've been in, you know, I'm happy to talk to Jake Sullivan or Avril Haines. If Avril Haines is not briefed like she's supposed to be, then we have a problem. All intelligence in the country falls under 50 US Code Section 3024. The Director of National Intelligence has oversight of everything from all federal agencies that is Intel-related. Well, ma'am, if you don't know what I'm talking about, we have a problem because you're not being briefed by the CIA Director and some other agencies.

Joe Rogan:

Well, listen, David, I really appreciate what you've done. I think you've provided a great service to humanity just by taking a stand and communicating these ideas, letting people know how much of this is real. You've opened up a world of discourse that probably would not have existed if you hadn't done that.

David Grusch:

Thanks. Yeah, I mean, this was not easy, I'm sure, so I appreciate it. Thank you very much for being here, and good luck in the future.

Joe Rogan:

Thank you.

David Grusch:

Thank you.

Joe Rogan:
All right, bye everybody.

[2:40:50]
[Music]
[Applause]
[Music]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kwsWAQ9sJZE>

Proof Of Aliens On Earth // 72 hrs with UFO whistleblower David Grusch Under Oath

[00:06 -> 05:05]

Yes Theory presents:

"The flying disk has been retrieved from Maxwell, New Mexico, and the possession of the object is in no way connected to any secret department of the United States. The Air Force, when called before a congressional committee, said it was hiding nothing. We have not been hiding anything. The sighting has been kept in the unidentified category. We've been perfectly willing to say that too. The Air Force is simply treating the American people like children; they don't trust them with the facts. It was not anything from this Earth. All I could do is keep my mouth shut. We must guard against the acquisition of unwanted influence by the military-industrial complex.

"There are great ideas undiscovered, great truths available to those who can remove truth's protective layers." - Neil Armstrong, First Man on the Moon.

"Yes, there have been ET visitations, there have been crashed craft, and there is some group of people somewhere that have this knowledge." - Edgar Mitchell, Sixth Man on the Moon.

Now, the vehicle you just described, how similar was it to the very first sighting that you had back in 1951? Quite similar to that. Basically the same plain form vehicle; they were double saucer and taken there.

"I occasionally think how quickly our differences worldwide would vanish if we were facing an alien threat from outside this world. And yet I ask you, is not an alien force already among us?" - Ronald Reagan, 40th President of the USA.

The US Navy is finally acknowledging that videos appearing to show UFOs flying through the air are real. We have nothing that goes that fast and just turns, climbing at will. There's footage and records of objects in the sky that we don't know exactly what they are. We can't explain how they move, their trajectory. They did not have an easily explainable act.

Did you ever open up Roswell to let us know what is really going on there? So many people ask me that question. I won't talk to you about what I know about it, but it's very interesting. President Obama said that there is record of objects in the sky, these Unidentified Aerial Phenomena. And he says we don't know exactly what they are. What do you think that it is? I would ask him again. Thank you.

Apparently, the military has hundreds of these encounters, but most of the time they keep it to themselves. There is a stigma, and so a lot of these sightings are simply not reported. The floodgates could be open, as now the stigma is beginning to be removed.

A former US intelligence official and Air Force veteran claims a

top-secret program is withholding evidence of alien spacecraft. Air Force veteran David Grusch is exposing what he calls "a top-secret military program that reportedly found wreckage of fully intact UFOs." Non-human, exotic origin vehicles that either landed or crashed.

We have spacecraft from another species? We do. How many? Quite a number. Congress this week is holding their first hearing on UFOs in more than 50 years. It begins with a highly anticipated hearing on Capitol Hill about unidentified flying objects. He's going to tell committee members that he has knowledge of a covert government program to recover crashed alien spacecraft.

Washington, DC. 24 hours before the hearing. Wow, so long in the making, bro. So long in the making. Hey, nice to meet you. Let's do it. You travel light, man. I do. I roll my clothes. You're having to put a tie on and a suit jacket; it's not a... All of that is in the bag? Oh yeah, I rolled it. Wow. That's hilarious. The large guy has the smallest suitcase.

So how did I end up in a car with the UFO whistleblower testifying in front of Congress tomorrow to let the world know that we're not alone? For that, we have to go back three years, where I found myself in the middle of a very bizarre experience that would push me to ask some of the most fundamental questions I've ever dared to ask about the nature of existence itself. In the fall of 2020, with no prior interest in the topic, I visited a small town in Massachusetts to talk to a number of people who had experienced a mass sighting of UFOs in September of 1969.

[05:11 -> 08:37]

Speaker:

Over 300 people from a few neighboring towns saw something in the sky that defied our known laws of physics. It just hovered right there, without a sound. Even more bizarre, dozens of children went missing that night and claimed to have ended up on board a craft. The only thing I can remember after that was being levitated over on the street. I had never felt a more unsettling disconnection between my intuition and rationale. On one hand, I felt an overwhelming sense of empathy towards these sincere individuals who opened up to me about their traumatic experiences. On the other hand, those events had no place in my construct of reality. Was I being lied to by dozens of people who had nothing to gain from this besides humiliation and judgment? Or is what I consider to be reality missing something?

In the months that followed, I gradually began researching the phenomenon. I watched hundreds of witness testimonies from civilians and military personnel from all over the world. What really stood out to me was that the majority of witnesses described similar details about their experiences, unaware of each other's stories. Even though the mere mention of the subject has been systematically stigmatized, things have changed quite a bit in recent years. The Navy states it still doesn't know what the objects are, and officials aren't speculating. A Navy spokesman simply confirmed to CNN that the objects seen in various clips are Unidentified Aerial Phenomena, or UAPs.

Public interest in UFOs began to rise after the New York Times published an article in 2017, confirming that there was indeed a secret Pentagon program studying UFOs after years of denial. With increased awareness came more pressure on the U.S. government, culminating in demands for serious answers regarding the UFO mystery. Then, in June of this year, a debrief article and a NewsNation interview emerged about an American whistleblower with groundbreaking information to share with the world.

We bring you a NewsNation exclusive interview with a man we're calling the UFO whistleblower. David Grusch is a career intelligence official who recently made bombshell claims of a U.S. government cover-up going back nearly a century. The UAP task force was refused access to a broad crash retrieval program. When you say crash retrieval, what do you mean? These involve retrieving non-human origin technical vehicles. The United States has intact spacecraft. We do. The secret program's mandate was to find and retrieve crashed or landed UFOs to reverse engineer them for technology that the government can utilize. Since extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence, Dave was called to the stand to back up his claims under oath for the first time in U.S. history.

But how did I meet Dave in the first place? This is the man who connected the dots. Jesse Michels and I met in 2022 due to our mutual interest in the phenomenon, and we've since gone on a few truth-seeking adventures together. He is one of the brightest and most well-read multidisciplinary thinkers I have ever met, and his curiosity on the subject has massively inspired me. Jesse and Dave had connected a year prior to the hearing, and just a few days before it was scheduled in D.C., Jesse organized a call to introduce me to Dave. By the end of it, I was convinced that his story had to be told not through the lens of a distorted news cycle, but rather through a meaningful exploration of his story and motives as a human.

On that same call, I took a shot in the dark and asked Dave if he would let us document his story as the congressional hearing unfolded. To my complete surprise, he said yes.

[08:40 -> 08:44]

Speaker 1:

In fact, we were the only ones who had this type of access to Dave during the hearing and the days that followed.

[08:45 -> 08:49]

Speaker 2:

I think it has been seeking discomfort.

[08:47 -> 08:49]

Speaker 1:

Yeah, I was going to say, this is the ultimate seeking discomfort.

[08:49 -> 08:50]

Speaker 2:

Seriously, yeah.

[08:50 -> 08:54]

Speaker 1:

It's not just seeking discomfort on an individual level to be in the place that you're in today; it's also what you're telling humanity is a moment of seeking discomfort for a collective.

[09:00 -> 09:02]

Speaker 2:

How do you expect this to go?

[09:02 -> 09:05]

Speaker 1:

I think there are people who have been kind of following the subject for years. I think it might be a little bit of a letdown because I can't necessarily say everything I know.

[09:05 -> 09:12]

Speaker 2:

You know, it's like, and I'm working on trying to get more things cleared for the hearing.

[09:12 -> 09:16]

Speaker 1:

Yeah.

[09:16 -> 09:18]

Speaker 2:

Literally, as I'm talking to the DOD (Department of Defense) security office, like as I was getting off the plane, "Please, get something approved by 10 a.m." because I want to be able to provide more detail.

[09:22 -> 09:29]

Speaker 1:

There's a certain thing where it's like, shouldn't it be the president saying this stuff? I don't want to be the purveyor of disclosure because I don't have all the data.

[09:29 -> 09:34]

Speaker 2:

I'm not in that leadership position, and I, you know, I'm just trying to use public pressure to kind of get the executive branch to make a decision on what to release.

[09:34 -> 09:50]

Speaker 1:

Yeah. Did all the checks I could possibly do, you know, within my official capacity, realized it was real. And then, during that investigation, I had a lot of pushback that was very unfortunate, you know, reprisals against me and stuff.

[10:01 -> 10:06]

Speaker 2:

And that kind of was what led me to file the whistleblower complaint, you know, for my own protection, but also to kind of sound the alarm.

[10:06 -> 10:12]

Speaker 1:

They tried to claim all these things against me, conduct-wise, mental health, all this other unfortunate stuff.

[10:12 -> 10:20]

Speaker 2:

I was in combat in Afghanistan in 2013; I was on convoys outside the wire. I had a friend die, got blown up, and all this other stuff, you know, baggage that I had for two to three years after coming back.

[10:20 -> 10:25]

Speaker 1:

And, you know, I got diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder, sought treatment, and I got help good to go.

[10:25 -> 10:30]

Speaker 2:

But there was an agency that tried to dig that back up and say, "Oh, Dave still has ongoing issues."

[10:30 -> 10:44]

Speaker 1:

Unmitigated, we need to pull his clearance. And then I had to show my medical records and be like, "No, dude, I sought treatment; I still do because that's what you do."

[10:44 -> 10:50]

Speaker 2:

And they tried to use that against me. It was crazy. You know, I spent basically two years fighting that battle, appealed it, won it, cleared of all allegations, and I still have my security clearance.

[11:00 -> 11:12]

Speaker 1:

It's been 20 minutes, and I can't even begin to express, yeah, it's I feel sad that he had to go through what he had to go through to simply share the truth.

[11:12 -> 11:20]

Speaker 2:

And for someone who served the country and sorted that to be used against him, like, it's weird because it's both an exciting position to be hearing this stuff straight from him, but also very sad to see what he went through to be in the place that he's in today.

[11:20 -> 11:40]

Speaker 1:

Yeah.

[11:51 -> 11:52]

Diane Maceda:

Hi, I'm Diane Maceda. We begin with a highly anticipated hearing on Capitol Hill about unidentified flying objects, or UFOs.

[11:52 -> 11:58]

Diane Maceda:

Three men who previously served in the military are set to speak publicly about what they saw in the sky and heard behind closed doors.

[11:58 -> 12:06]

Diane Maceda:

It is the day of the hearing. We've got people waiting in line for us, which means that we'll just go swap with them and be able to go into the hearing.

[12:21 -> 12:25]

Diane Maceda:

Good morning.

[12:25 -> 12:27]

Speaker 2:

It's a little difficult, yeah.

[12:27 -> 12:27]

Diane Maceda:

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

[12:28 -> 16:26]

Speaker 1:

Humidity's not too bad yet, so I'm keeping the suit jacket off.

[12:31]

Speaker 2:

It looks amazing for having been rolled up in a backpack.

[12:35]

Speaker 1:

Thank you.

[12:36]

Speaker 2:

You gotta roll it tight.

[12:37]

Speaker 1:

I used to go to the Pentagon a lot.

[12:39]

Speaker 2:

I'd bring like a sweat rag with me in the summer.

[12:41]

Speaker 1:

I'd, you know, once I'm entering the Pentagon, I'm like wiping my sweat off.

[12:45]

Speaker 2:

So, yeah.

[12:47]

Speaker 1:

How are you feeling?

[12:48]

Speaker 2:

I was a little restless last night.

[12:52]

Speaker 1:

I was told last night that they requested me to be cleared for a closed session after today, but the request was denied.

[13:00]

Speaker 2:

I was blocked.

[13:02]

Speaker 1:

So that's like obvious obstruction.

[13:04]

Speaker 2:

Yeah, hopefully I can make a difference.

[13:06]

Speaker 1:

You know, I'm the guy that will inspire more people to go public.

[13:15]

Speaker 2:

He's in.

[13:16]

Speaker 1:

I just can't imagine the amount of pressure he's under right now.

[13:20]

Speaker 2:

Like coming out to say something that people in this government and other governments have wanted to be silenced for the past 70 to 80 years.

[13:28]

Speaker 1:

Right now we're going to go take our position in line because they're going to open in about an hour, so.

[13:34]

Speaker 2:

He is going to tell committee members that he has knowledge through his work of a covert government program to recover crashed alien spacecraft under penalty of perjury before Congress.

[13:47]

Speaker 1:

Those are the allegations that this whistleblower, David Grush, is going to make right through these doors right here.

[13:57]

Speaker 2:

I'm actually first in line.

[13:59]

Speaker 1:

I've been standing here since 2 a.m.

[14:10]

Speaker 2:

One night away from going into what could potentially be a pivotal moment for humanity.

[14:20]

Speaker 1:

You see right now that there are people that are coming in, but we just got some news and what you're about to see is these doors close relatively quickly, and I think there you go.

[14:30]

Speaker 2:

That may be all that there is.

[14:31]

Speaker 1:

The reason that you just saw that is because we have this line here.

[14:35]

Speaker 2:

You have another line around that corner, but they only have about six or seven available seats.

[14:41]

Speaker 1:

You've got, again, hundreds of people waiting in line, if not more than that.

[14:45]

Speaker 2:

So what I'm told is there is going to be an overflow room, Brian,

that's set up.

[14:49]

Speaker 1:

So the interest is huge, obviously, and we're seeing it firsthand here today.

[15:13]

Speaker 2:

The subcommittee hearing on Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena, or UAPs, will come to order.

[15:19]

Speaker 1:

The UFO is emerging as a major topic of global importance.

[15:22]

Speaker 2:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[15:30]

Speaker 1:

I do.

[15:31]

Speaker 2:

I was informed in the course of my official duties of a multi-decade UAP crash retrieval and reverse engineering program.

[15:38]

Speaker 1:

I made the decision, based on the data I collected, to report this information to my superiors and multiple inspectors general, effectively becoming a whistleblower.

[15:50]

Speaker 2:

During a training mission in Warning Area Whiskey 72, 10 miles off the coast of Virginia Beach, two F-18 Super Hornets were split by a UAP.

[15:55]

Speaker 1:

The object, described as a dark gray or black cube inside of a clear sphere, came within 50 feet of the lead aircraft.

[16:04]

Speaker 2:

Soon, these encounters became so frequent that aircrew would discuss the risk of UAP as part of their regular pre-flight briefs.

[16:10]

Speaker 1:

If you were me, where would you look?

[16:13]

Speaker 2:

Titles, programs, departments, regions.

[16:18]

Speaker 1:

If you could just name anything.

[16:21]

Speaker 2:

I'd be happy to give you that in a closed environment. I can tell you specifically.

[16:25]

Speaker 1:

Thank you.

[16:26]

Speaker 2:

Do you believe our government has made contact with intelligent extraterrestrials?

[16:31 -> 20:14]

David Grusch:

Something I can't discuss in a public setting.

[16:34]

Interviewer:

Do you believe that our government is in possession of UAPs?

[16:37]

David Grusch:

Absolutely, based on interviewing over 40 witnesses over four years.

[16:42]

Interviewer:

Are you aware of any individuals that are participating in reverse engineering programs for non-terrestrial craft?

[16:47]

David Grusch:

Personally, yes.

[16:49]

Interviewer:

Do you believe UAPs pose a potential threat to our national security?

[16:53]

David Grusch:

Yes, and here's why.

[16:55]

David Grusch:

The technology that we faced was far superior to anything that we had, and you could put that anywhere.

[16:59]

David Grusch:

You're talking about something that can go into space, go someplace, drop down in a matter of seconds, do whatever it wants, and leave, and there's nothing we can do about it. Nothing.

[17:11]

Interviewer:

Do you have any personal knowledge of people who have been harmed or injured in efforts to cover up or conceal this extraterrestrial technology?

[17:18]

David Grusch:

Yes.

[17:19]

Interviewer:

In the last couple of years, have you had incidents that have caused you to be in fear for your life for addressing these issues?

[17:25]

David Grusch:

Yes, personally.

[17:27]

Interviewer:

I just want everyone to note that he's coming forward in fear of his life. To put it in perspective, if they were really not scared about this information coming out, why would someone be intimidated like that?

[17:39]

David Grusch:

I want to thank everybody. We made history today.

[17:45]

David Grusch:

Thank you.

[17:48]

Interviewer:

I have no baseline for knowing if this went well or not, but from my perspective, there was a lot of repetition.

[17:52]

Interviewer:

A lot of the questions were just alluding to things that were already mentioned in public before.

[17:55]

Interviewer:

I wish there was a lot more attention on Dave and Dave's story.

[18:02]

Interviewer:

Why is this case so significant?

[18:04]

David Grusch:

If you could put it into a sentence, why is this here?

[18:08]

David Grusch:

It all boils down to transparency.

[18:10]

David Grusch:

People don't trust the government for good reason.

[18:13]

David Grusch:

We need to get this information out, and it needs to be worldwide so that the whole world can benefit from this.

[18:19]

Interviewer:

Amazing, thank you.

[18:21]

David Grusch:

Love over fear.

[18:23]

Interviewer:

Thank you, brother.

[18:25]

Interviewer:

Even though the hearing felt like a great step in the right direction, it still left me pretty frustrated that most questions asked were from the lens of the national security interests of the U.S., when clearly the implications of this topic are far beyond that.

[18:38]

Interviewer:

And that gave me the idea to do a different type of hearing with Dave the following day.

[18:42]

Interviewer:

It is now the day after the hearing, and the news has gone absolutely viral all over the world.

[18:46]
Interviewer:
David Grusch.

[18:47]
Interviewer:
David Grusch.

[18:48]
Interviewer:
David Grusch.

[18:49]
Interviewer:
David Grusch.

[19:25]
Interviewer:
Having friends I talked about these topics with years ago hit me up saying, "Oh my god! what is this? what is going on?"

[19:32]
Interviewer:
An idea that we had, honestly, after the hearing, is what it would look like to set up a true public hearing where Dave gets to answer questions from strangers who are coming here not having any idea that they're going to be talking to the whistleblower who is telling humanity that we're not alone.

[19:47]
Interviewer:
I posted on Instagram last night saying, "Hey, if you are a skeptic or a believer in UFOs, please send me your most pressing question."

[19:55]
Interviewer:
We set up this little public hearing on the rooftop of our hotel, and now we're just going to go out and say hi to people and bring them up here.

[20:06]
Interviewer:
Hi guys, nice to meet you.

[20:10]
Interviewer:
Alright guys, we're going to Antarctica all together.

[20:14]
Interviewer:
The Yes Fam is the only group of people that will show up to something they have absolutely no idea about.

[20:20 -> 23:59]

David Grusch:

But I promise it's going to be worth it. I still can't say much until we get up there.

Let's seek discomfort and follow me.

We're all set up.

Public hearing number two.

This group is a pretty even split between skeptics and believers, and we want both perspectives to be represented here in the questions that you ask.

This is a true public hearing.

Yeah, they told me last night.

I thought, well, this is going to be crazy.

How do you feel after yesterday?

Good. I mean, it felt like when I was playing basketball in high school; you get the pregame jitters. You're like, "Oh my God, what's going to go on?"

You know, it was so cool to see the bipartisanship.

It's just gotten so bad over the last ten years where, you know, it's the liberals and the super-conservatives.

I thought it was the craziest thing I was telling him in the car I have AOC and Matt Gaetz agreeing on something.

Should we open the floor?

I guess one of the questions that I have is, why do the politicians like, why do people who are higher up feel like they need to hide the evidence?

Why do they not want us to know that?

Yeah, I mean, I can only know what the mindset was, you know, multiple decades ago, and like anything in government, they're resistant to change.

So this is the way we set it up.

They basically took the Manhattan Project secrecy and overlaid it on this issue.

And then they realized the military and the national defense potential if the reverse engineering was basically successful.

So we're going to lock it down.

And then you remember trusting government was high back in the forties post-war.

And then also society was less secular.

So there's, you know, they're worried about the religious ontological shocks as well.

And they never really developed a, we'll call it a "disclosure plan" for what it's worth.

And they just were like, "This is the way it's been, and we're going to keep it that way.

And we don't want Russia and China to be exposed to any of this info."

Fortunately, it's that kind of low-energy thinking, you know?
 - Yeah. - Next question, please.

So continuing from what you were saying, are we safe as a human species?

'Cause I mean, I might have watched too many movies.

I mean, we can only, you know, through external observation and a humanistic lens, kind of, you know, see intent of its malice or benevolence.

I mean, if the universe certainly has a yin and yang, so there are certainly dark with light.

So I think it's a mixed bag.

It's just like humans, right?

Humans are generally kind, but we also kill animals for food.

And like, if you were a cow, you'd be like, "These evil humans are going to chop me up and, like, you know, eat me."

So it's, but we're not actually benevolent or excuse me, malevolent as a whole, but some lower sentient species would see us as malevolent.

So it's what lens you look at it through.

And I be very general in this to protect this person's identity, 'cause they're still on active duty.

But like, I remember interviewing a guy, and I have a background in psychological analysis and other stuff to assess people, and for like three hours.

And it was a certain very senior Navy individual that said he was going to work at a certain facility in the morning, you know, not drunk, not high.

[24:04 -> 27:15]

David Grusch:

A 300-foot triangular craft hovered over his car for a couple of minutes. He couldn't even process what he was seeing, but afterward, he took pictures of his car, and all the upper-facing decks were hit with ionizing radiation. The paint became milky, and his headlights were totally clear. His car was perfect before the incident. I was amazed; he had physical artifacts. The individual we assessed had a normal psychological composition no unusual belief system. He was just a guy going to work at a Navy base, and he encountered this massive craft, at least providing physical proof. He drew what he saw: no sound, these strange omni-directional lights, kind of that classic triangular shape. I thought, "Holy crap, I didn't believe in UFOs, but these guys can't be lying to me." They are credible individuals with a lot to lose. He was super scared to come forward; he didn't tell his wife for five years. That was, I think, an inflection point for me where I realized there was something significant happening.

This was not adversarial technology; these people were literally in tears telling me their experiences. It was an emotional event that they could not process analytically. It was completely beyond their comprehension. For what it's worth, I've never seen anything, believe it or not. I came in as a non-believer, and this is coming from someone who's a bit of a skeptic. I understand that the US, Russia,

and China are very adept at maintaining secrecy, but there are 180-some odd countries, 190-some odd other countries. Why haven't we seen more of this coming out from smaller nations? You mentioned Grenada and San Marino. Have we seen more of this? Are people just not paying attention, or has there been a lot of pressure to remain silent?

There are certainly friendly governments, both across the pond and local to where we are, that support this. Many of them know they got a raw deal with the US because they were part of the secrecy through agreements, both bilateral and unilateral. They want to be released from this secrecy because they realize it was a bad deal. Some argue, "How could they keep the secret?" I'm like, "Dude, I was cleared to some of the most sensitive programs in the nation. I used to handle the Presidential Daily Briefing. I had full access to most Department of Defense activities, and most of the enduring broad programs have never leaked." The US and its allies are very good at maintaining secrecy, including programs that are global in nature.

In some strange way, information has been leaking for many decades. It's been mixed in with some misinformation in ufology, but the general gist has actually been out there for a long time. It has been leaking in some sense. I guess I want to open it up and ask: why don't we discuss cognitive biases in general? Where you grew up defines how you perceive things. If I look up at something in the sky and I'm searching for something, and I really want it to be true, then it will be true.

[27:17 -> 29:58]

Speaker 1:

Or maybe it's the fact that as a child, you saw aliens that were green and had antennas. I don't know, I guess I'm just wondering why we're coming to conclusions about their existence.

Speaker 2:

Oh yeah.

Speaker 1:

Because I'm skeptical, I guess. I think maybe it's fabricated to an extent based on our beliefs.

Speaker 2:

Yeah. It's like manifesting your own reality based on your...

Speaker 1:

I know, I totally get that. Even some of the metaphysics, and I was super careful with confirmation bias and all that. I came in skeptical, like with the Fermi paradox. Enrico Fermi famously asked, "Where are they?" You know, overtly landing on the White House lawn kind of thing.

Speaker 2:

But because we have tangible physical evidence at least the US government does there is evidence of their existence. But what are

they really? You know, like we talked about, if they do exhibit bilateral symmetry and are bipedal, that's fascinating. What are the chances biologically for them to develop in a similar way to us?

Speaker 1:

What if it's an intelligence engineering beings to look like us for ease of contact? It's totally worth looking into. I wish it were an area of study that wasn't stigmatized anymore, where people could say, "Here's the data the government has. Figure it out."

Speaker 2:

The guy who's a tenured PhD Nobel nominee at Stanford claims to have crashed parts with isotope ratios not from this Earth, and he's studying it. You have a guy at Harvard, the head of the astrophysics department, who has set up an entire institute to find these things.

Speaker 1:

We should never evangelize or proselytize the answer being that there are definitely aliens, but I think reality is a lot weirder than we think, probably due to a lot of empirical stuff that people have picked up. It's our job to look into it.

Speaker 2:

This is more about getting people to ask bigger, better questions rather than necessarily having answers. What we're creating with Dave and Jesse becomes an invitation for people to look deeper into this. We're going to make sure to leave in the description a list of things to read, things to watch, and interviews to check out.

Speaker 1:

Yeah. My biggest outrage was just like, wait, if this were broadly studied like nuclear physics how you make a nuclear bomb is classified physics, not the study of it. The sequestration of astrobiology, astrophysics, etc., where you could build undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral programs to actually study this openly holy shit, that's way better!

Speaker 2:

And we could potentially develop novel solutions for energy, etc. Who knows? But no, it was sequestered because it's like this arms race thing. I'm like, man, this is ridiculous. And that was another reason why I whistleblowed.

Speaker 1:

Has this changed your perception on theology?

[30:02 -> 33:14]

David Grusch:

I grew up Roman Catholic as a kid, going through the whole confirmation process and CCD. It was reasonably religious, but nothing too extreme just the average experience. I studied physics and eventually became somewhat agnostic. I thought, "Eh, I don't know about all this woo-woo stuff that the church promotes." Oddly enough, I've come full circle. I think about the people and the journey I've

had, especially the most random individuals who entered my life about 14 years ago. They came into my office at the NGA, shut the door, and said, "Look, dude." They started sharing all this information with me, and they brought these incredible intelligence reports that I couldn't believe I was reading. It was wild I'm not trying to be hyperbolic at all.

I guess I've come full circle; it's been a really strange journey. What does the future look like? It seems like all we can do right now is research. I know there are some intelligence officers and others in and out of government who are about to file complaints similar to what I did because they said, "Forget it." These are firsthand individuals not just people telling me things, but literally the ones who have been involved with the programs.

In February of 2024, we should have a presidential panel on UAP disclosure that will address the crash retrieval issue and everything related to it. Within 300 days of the enactment of the act, I believe we will receive some kind of government statement on this topic next year. The tsunami wave is building, and I don't think we're going to backpedal anymore. Beyond that, it would be pure speculation, but at least that's what we can expect. I think 2024 has the potential to be wild in a good way, knock on wood.

Do you think this will lead countries, especially the U.S. and its adversaries, to work together or push them apart? I'm hoping it will be de-escalatory regarding pure competition. We have bigger issues to address and worry about. I understand it won't create a utopian society where no one cares about feudalistic dominance like the situations in Russia, China, the South China Sea, or Ukraine. But I hope it serves as a moment of pause, allowing people to reassess their priorities and come together more than we currently do.

I believe this could be a unifying force rather than a divisive one. I hope that is a result of what I did; that would be good for me. I've been in war and witnessed the evils of the world, and I'd rather not continue down that path. Humanity is not on a good trajectory right now, and I think everyone can agree that it's divergent. There are very dangerous hot wars that could lead to a scenario like World War III.

There's something beautiful about us reassessing our entire existence and figuring out how to move forward if reality is even crazier than we ever thought. The only thing we can do is influence our local environments and strive to be as good, kind, and loving as possible. That's what will ripple into the greater reality we are a part of. I hope you all realize how truly unique and historic this moment is. There are certainly millions of people who would want to be in this room having this conversation after yesterday.

[33:17 -> 38:38]

Speaker 1:

It is really wild that we get to have this opportunity. Thank you for sitting.

Speaker 2:
Yeah.

Speaker 1:
I'm proud of the crazy spark. The crazy spark is that we're going home with him today. Like we're flying back to Colorado.

Speaker 1:
So now we're about to go to Dave's house. Everyone is trying to do their best to be as sensitive and caring about the topic as possible. As he said the other day, he would rather not do this and would prefer someone else to do it, but it feels like he has to do it, and he has all my respect. There's this quote that says, "Speak even if your voice is shaking." The thing with Dave is that his voice never shakes. It feels like he's the most confident man I've met in years.

Speaker 2:
It's beautiful.

Speaker 1:
Yeah.

Speaker 2:
So we don't film the exterior.

Speaker 1:
Yeah. Just making sure nobody knows I live here. Thank you for having us.

Speaker 2:
Yeah.

Speaker 1:
It feels pretty surreal to be in his house right now. His phone has not stopped ringing, hanging up on reporters all day. He's such a cutie; you're such a cutie. How were you feeling during the hearing?

Speaker 2:
I probably cried through the first hour of it, just like relief, and everybody treated him with respect. Everybody had done their research. I think it just went so well. From the previous four years of him getting dragged through the mud, it was just a big relief.

Speaker 1:
Yeah, absolutely. Did you have any views or opinions on the phenomenon before it kind of came about?

Speaker 2:
No, not really. I'm not a big sci-fi person. He would come home and tell me general stuff, and I'd be like, "Yeah, that makes sense." Yeah, there's probably aliens; that makes sense.

Speaker 1:

I think Dave is inspiring people beyond this subject. He dares to speak about something and gives the opportunity to other people to speak about something. He's enabling other people to speak their truth.

Speaker 1:

For the next few hours, Jesse sat down with Dave for the most in-depth public interview that Dave has given to date. You can watch it on Jesse's channel, so please check it out after this one. At this point, we had all been going non-stop on the topic since the hearing took place, so we decided to have a change of pace after Dave invited us out on an adventure.

Speaker 2:

I had the fastest llama. At the end, everybody was saying, "Oh my God," because the llama was just going for it. Dave ran this morning in a llama race with his wife; they placed 17th, so.

Speaker 1:

Hi, buddy.

Speaker 2:

Colorado tradition. I'm holding on for America.

Speaker 1:

So this is apparently one of Dave's favorite things to do in the world, so let's do some ATV together with him. To see Dave being Dave.

Speaker 2:

I minored in German in college and was majoring in physics, so I've just kept up with the language over the years.

Speaker 1:

Oh my God.

Speaker 1:

And before we said goodbye to Dave, we went on one last hike to get some answers to some of our biggest unanswered questions.

Speaker 2:

why did you decide to do this with us?

Speaker 1:

I was watching your episodes, and I liked their vibe. A friend of mine two years ago was like, "Hey, you ever watch Yes Theory?"

[38:41 -> 42:08]

David Grusch:

I have a decent subscription. You touch the younger demographic; it's uplifting. You're bringing cultures together and uniting cultures, and everything. I thought that's great because, as someone who's unfortunately been on the side of state versus state, seeing a different, more uniting kind of message was nice to see. I saw how you

affect a lot of people with your positive vibes, and I thought it would make sense to go through you guys.

Over the past days, you shared with us that you were diagnosed as being on the autism spectrum. How has this served you in your life and career, and how has it hindered you?

Yeah, I mean, I didn't know that I was autistic until I was in my early thirties. I always wondered why, in my personal life, I would get fixated on something and become obsessed. It served me well in the government because I was very good at doing intelligence work. For example, if they said, "Dave, we want you to target this facility," I would have six months to figure out everything, and of course, I would do it. That was very effective.

But it also causes me to be very detail-oriented. I always want to tell the truth; my instinct is just to say it as it is. I have no filter.

What would you tell a normal person who is processing all this? Would you give any advice? If you could give any advice to a normal person watching, what would you tell them?

Yeah, I empathize with the shocking nature of it. It enters your worldview in a weird way, right? It's like, "Holy crap." But think about it: we're just revealing another aspect of nature. It's just another discovery, like splitting the atom or realizing that the solar system is heliocentric and that the Earth is not at the center.

Humankind may not be the apex of sentience, and there is other life out there. Whether you believe in God or not, nature paints with a broad brush. We're revealing another exciting aspect of nature that I think will make us feel a lot less lonely.

I like what I was telling you about. I think anyone who is struggling with meaning or depression might find this helpful to get them excited. For young people thinking about what they want to study, I hope this inspires them to want to know more. It can be a little scary to discover some shocking things that can really change your worldview, but I think it's generally for the best.

My question is about the people who have come forward because you mentioned that they are colleagues and people you've worked with for over a decade. I can't even imagine the psychological weight that is on one of the people in the program. How are they even existing on a personal level?

I think they wanted to get the weight off their shoulders and explain what they thought was wrong. Even though they signed a non-disclosure agreement, they are patriotic and really good people. These are not evil individuals. They thought it was a raw deal.

The funny thing is, if you're in a non-acknowledged program, you don't even know what you're being briefed on when they say, "Hey, we need

you to sign an NDA; you're going to be on something cool." You ask, "what is it?" and they respond, "we can't tell you until you sign." So, they sign it, and then they see all the stipulations and how it's enforced. We're briefed in a very threatening manner, and I think they probably wish they had never signed it.

[42:12 -> 45:23]

David Grusch:

It just shows to the cynics too who are like, it would have come out. There'd be photos. There are sort of crazy controls in place, brutal enforcement.

Yeah. And what was the last special access program that leaked? They don't generally leak. No, people are like, oh, dude, wouldn't it be broadly leaked or whatever? I'm like, as somebody who is super cleared to a lot of that conventional stuff over the years, stuff never leaks.

Yeah. It doesn't come out. There are plenty of things that are pretty serious, they're broad, that have never seen the light of day. You know, the psychology of the typical career government worker, right? Stable paycheck, pension, maintain clearance. So if any of that's threatened, you know, they're going to capitulate in most cases, right?

And, you know, that was basically what happened to me, but I, you know, just decided to fight the system. I stumbled upon this, which arguably is the most interesting and fascinating and exciting thing ever. Well, why would I go back to doing my normal job and just shutting my mouth and sitting in my office and doing regular national defense stuff? Because our priorities are not even right if this other thing is legit.

Do you think the fact that you're neurodivergent was this like curveball? Do you think that came into play? Because your response is so different than what...

Yeah, I think my response is so analytical. I like don't even think about it emotionally. My divergence really helped keep the train on the tracks, you know, looking at this stuff. They didn't consider my zest to continue the mission because, you know, once you get me going, you know, it's hard to pull the brakes on the train.

Because we did something really special right after the hearing. The following morning, we just, you know, brought in the Yes Fam into the room. And I would say this had to be your first time taking questions from the public like that, no?

Oh, 100%.

Yeah.

I've like never done that. Ever.

wow. How did it feel to just be receiving questions that you just know are coming from curiosity, not an agenda?

People seem genuinely interested. I mean, even if they were skeptical, that's super healthy. Like, you shouldn't just be like, oh yeah, if he says it, it's totally legit. Well, do your own lit review or whatever. And I thought it was super cool.

Yeah.

And that was cool to see what people were thinking. And it gives me kind of a pulse on, you know, non-government-y people and what their concerns are, not media heads or whatever, right?

One sort of bombshell soundbite from the hearing is Congresswoman Nancy Mace asked you about biologics. If you believe we have crashed craft, as stated earlier, do we have the bodies of the pilots who piloted this craft?

As I've stated publicly already in my News Nation interview, biologics came with some of these recoveries.

Yeah.

Yeah. I mean, it is a mind-blowing side of it, right? It's a little easy to imagine, you know, an artifact or whatever, but when you start talking about, you know, the biological side of it, it really throws you for a loop psychologically. It did for me.

And, you know, I talked to the people that, you know, were on that aspect of, uh, the program, if you will. And, uh, I mean, it comes with the territory. I mean, buckle up, I guess. It's a thing.

were they alive? Were they dead?

I don't want to get into specifics.

I know a lot of that stuff. Out of curiosity, why are you allowed to say that NHI (Non-Human Intelligence) pilots came out of the craft, but you can't?

[45:30 -> 48:44]

David Grusch:

well, that's all I put in the pre-publication stuff that got approved. I mean, got it. I could go back and ask for more. Any specific knowledge I garnered when I was on the other side of the door, if I want to talk about that publicly, everybody who has had a job like I have has to submit it to a thing called DOPSR at the Pentagon, the DoD Pre-Publication Security Review. You know, even if it's about this stuff. Like, I know it sounds insane, but you literally have to say, "This is what I want to talk about."

Interviewer:

why do you think they approved it?

David Grusch:

Catch-22. Because they would have to self-identify and highlight their concerns to redact. So, the office that would propose a redaction, say it's a three-letter agency or whatever, would have to self-acknowledge. So, I think when I submitted that, they had a choice, right? Either we try to sequester Dave's ability to speak publicly and tell him no, but then we have to give him a reason and tell him what organization said no. If it got redacted like that and it cited what organization and what security reason it is, I would just publish that. Then the public can make its own interpretation of why the U.S. government is withholding information about that kind of thing and wanted to sequester my speech.

Interviewer:

You were also honest in the hearing and definitively said you hadn't seen the bodies. Is that right?

David Grusch:

Not personally, no.

Interviewer:

Not personally?

David Grusch:

No. So, just people who, very high trust, I had a lot of intersection career-wise with them. But they have. The people that I interviewed have. And they were some of the people that were interviewed by the inspector general. Because that was the thing; people are like, "Oh, hearsay, whatever." Okay, I understand secondhand. I literally brought the people firsthand to the authorities. I'm just here as the meeting monkey or the unifier, trying to bring everybody together and connect the people who do have that knowledge to the right people.

Interviewer:

So, it feels like this was the perfect set of circumstances for you to be the one that blows the whistle because firsthand knowledge would have put you in a completely different category of being able to disclose this stuff, right?

David Grusch:

If I became subject to a non-disclosure agreement by becoming a firsthand guy, it actually would have hindered me, and I would have never been able to do this. I think about some stuff I was denied access to. And thank God I am, right? If I signed that non-disclosure agreement, I would have absolutely not been able to do this.

Interviewer:

Wow.

David Grusch:

Then I would have been trapped.

Interviewer:

I would have been trapped.

David Grusch:

So, it's actually weird that my lack of that, but knowing the people that do, though. And I brought those people to the IG. Is the only way I was able to get... So, the actual reprisal stuff and the access denial stuff actually enhanced my ability to operate. But I will tell you, I talked to these people in the program. They are just so afraid. Because of the way it was enforced over the years, the threatening nature of some of their indoctrinations where they're like, "This is treason. You're going to Leavenworth if you ever tell anybody not in the program." And oh, by the way, what's the penalty for treason? Oh, right. Execution, right?

Interviewer:

Did you ever at any point try to suss out whether you were being lied to?

David Grusch:

Oh, 100%. Because all of these people are coming from the same programs. And so, presumably, there's some level of coordination between them. So, how do you kind of get through and just make sure that they're not meeting in some backroom saying, "You say this to Dave, I'll say this to Dave"?

[48:47 -> 52:10]

David Grusch:

Yeah, no, for sure. So, I also went out of my way to find people who don't know each other either. That way, I could avoid circular reporting and ensure I wasn't part of some other faction that might want to push a certain narrative. My higher-ranking colleagues, who were part of the same effort in their official capacity, went to talk to other individuals that I didn't personally engage with, maintaining that separation. They didn't know they were feeding some of that information back to me. I had several people go out just to ensure I wasn't being targeted. I also had others conduct oral history interviews, and they were getting the same information. We compiled all that data, and I made sure that everyone who conducted those interviews was interviewed by the inspector general. We were crossing our T's here because this situation is crazy.

I mean, you can never be perfect, but I was extremely careful to ensure I wasn't being fed misinformation. The quality of people we talked to is remarkable. If they ever go public, it will blow your mind who we spoke with. We're talking about serious players who were confirmed by the Senate years ago. I'll just leave it at that. I hope they eventually decide to go public. I understand the reputational risks and the potential impact on their legacy. They might have a different perspective than I do regarding protecting the information and what should be acknowledged. However, I believe that if they want to do the right thing before they sunset in their lives, this would be a noble action if they're watching right now. They know who they are, and it would be great.

The past days have brought me to a point where I trust this guy about 90%. This experience took that trust from 90% to 100%. Seeing his eyes light up when discussing certain topics is significant to me. It's not just about receiving a set of information that I believe in or not; it's about the feeling I get from another human being. Ultimately, that's where this journey began. My growing curiosity started when I met Melanie during our Berkshire story, where I felt a strong sense of empathy towards her. Experiencing the same connection with Dave that I had with her only reinforces my belief that this is the path we are meant to be on and want to pursue.

We did it, boys. We did it. We did it.

One of the most prominent and credible figures in the UFO world today is Dr. Garry Nolan, a name you've heard mentioned a couple of times already. Garry Nolan has publicly stated that he had unusual experiences with the phenomenon as a child. He is a world-class cancer researcher, a tenured professor at Stanford, and an extremely intelligent individual. He openly shares his personal connection with the phenomenon. There is much to admire about Dr. Nolan's accomplishments. He is an inventor, an immunologist, a professor at Stanford University, a Nobel Prize nominee, and the list goes on.

In my opinion, what I find most impressive about Dr. Nolan is his courage to speak out about his beliefs regarding the UFO phenomenon and his personal experiences with it. Jesse connected the dots once again, and Dr. Nolan...

[52:12 -> 55:50]

David Grusch:

We agreed to meet at his lab at the Stanford School of Medicine. This was developed by one of my postdocs, Mike Angelo, who's now a professor here. It actually reads metals. It's in a vacuum. That's an iron gun. There it is. I feel so dumb right now. Hello, hello, hello. Just seeing some UFO pieces. Yeah, we can pull that out again maybe towards the end.

Has discussing the topic and going deeper into the research affected your career negatively in any way?

I'm sure a little bit. You know, I mean, I know that there are people who've said, you know, "Oh, Gary, what's he doing?" You know, but first of all, I don't care. But even before I got involved with UFOs, I had plenty of ideas that everybody said, "Well, that's not going to work."

- Yeah.

Or "why are you doing that?" And I was like, "I know it's going to work."

Because people pushed back on you wanting to start companies earlier in your career, right?

well, they said you shouldn't. You're an assistant professor. You shouldn't be starting a company. Why? I mean, if you let other people define your life and what questions you can ask, stop.

- Amen.

Right. So just go for it. No one else is going to do it. If you have a burning desire to do it, you're going to let people stop you.

Imagine other people who don't have your confidence who are also being stopped.

I've always thought that if the implications of the secrecy around the phenomenon are true, then it's probably the biggest violation against science that has ever existed.

- Right.

Because we've kept it secret. We've prevented some of the brightest minds that have walked on this planet from looking into it.

- Right.

That's infuriating.

Oh, yeah. For me, what infuriates me is lost potential.

- Yeah.

So that's an example of lost potential. You know, my personal anecdotes are not enough. If I want to convince scientists, there has to be a scientific approach to the whole thing. And now I'm sort of in the right place at the right time with the right tools and the right talents to do it.

I mean, it's almost amazing that I have the kinds of analysis tools in my laboratory alone that are sufficient to allow me to ask some of the questions that will answer what some of the materials are and how they're put together.

Whether it's real or not, it's a phenomenon that multiple people experience. Enough people have experienced it that, as we were talking earlier, asking the question about it is going to lead to an answer no matter what, and it's going to be an interesting answer.

If it's some sort of delusion, why do people have the delusion? I mean, that's the easy way to explain it away. But if it has some kind of reality, that's even more interesting. So, you know, it's worth asking.

Why do you think we've shut down every person that has tried to ask these questions up until a couple of years ago?

People have a mindset about what reality is and how it's composed. You

could probably go a thousand years ago to a village somewhere and say, "Hey, there's a bunch of people who live in the next village or on an island somewhere, and they don't look like us." And you would get a lot of people going, "Oh, I don't believe it," because it's an effort to change your worldview or to use your brain.

So I think that's just sort of built into our psyche, to be inherently conservative. There's something worth studying here.

[55:52 -> 59:54]

David Grusch:

It is not understandable in human terms. I look at something like that and I say, "Wow, okay, I can now imagine all kinds of different possibilities of what it might be," which, as a scientist, gets me excited. I don't mind a critic; I just don't want you to position it to shut them down and not ask the question in the first place, because that is what holds everybody back. Suddenly, I had in my laboratory a whole bunch of instruments of different flavors that could work on metals. Around that time, I contacted Jacques and others and said, "Hey, we've got this stuff, you know, and here's a whole bunch of them, right? We've got this stuff, much of which is metals. Can you help us?"

These are all mostly through Jacques, who claimed they were from debris left over something left behind, something that dropped off an aircraft these molten metals that are often seen. Jacques has spent an enormous amount of time over the decades tracing the stories, getting a chain of custody, speaking to the people individually, speaking to the people around them, and accepting nothing as it's told, but distilling it down to a set of things, some of which he was able to share with me.

From how many countries? Brazil, United States, France. There's this perception that this is an American phenomenon, that it only happens in America, which is why I asked. No, it's not. I mean, it's just reporting bias, that's all. I published the first-ever peer-reviewed paper on that, and that was from a molten metal that fell in an area called Council Bluffs, where many people had seen this glowing object with lights rotating around it. They then saw something drop from it, and it was glowing. When the police arrived, there was a big pool of molten metal on the ground.

Okay, why? What is it? So I look at this, and it's interesting in and of itself, but I wonder, "Well, okay, why does a UFO need to drop molten metal?" I don't know. When you look at that, or you look at another case from someone in Australia, which involves another metal that dropped off of something, I have big chunks of it. He says it has a story behind it that is worth following up on. So, okay, well, that's not the same as that.

Yeah. Okay, so there's another one that I've got, which is from here in California. So here you have three or four different things that appear to have dropped something. They have a good story behind them, so what are the similarities? What's the difference? What is it? I

don't know yet, and again, I'm not going to say this proves anything. I'm just going to say, "Here's the range of things that people have, and here's the stories that look in the appendices about the details of the story, and here's what they're made of."

What's the most interesting data right now that you've found? I've looked at certain isotopes in the material and found that one of them had a natural magnesium ratio, while the other had magnesium ratios that were so far off Earth normal that the only way you could interpret them, frankly, is that they were engineered or part of an industrial process that resulted in them. There's no reason to do it. I mean, right now, we just use the mix. We use whatever we dig out of the ground, and if it has 80% of isotopes 9 and 11, let's say, of the three different isotopes, the percentages add up to 100, and we use it, but it...

[1:00:00 -> 1:01:39]

David Grusch:

It turns out that physicists and chemists are starting to realize that there are subtle differences that can be used to accomplish electronic goals at the atomic level that the general mix does not achieve. People have conducted elemental and isotopic analyses of these materials, but I'm going to take it to the next level. I will obtain the atomic positions of things in a volume to show how the atoms are organized.

So, you're essentially developing the instrumentation now to delve even deeper?

Yes. There is instrumentation available that I will use for this, but I'm tweaking it in a way that will enhance its effectiveness.

For a closing question, if you have a message for the world at this very interesting moment we are living in, as we seek discomfort and realize that we might not be alone well, we've never been alone.

I think that if "seeking discomfort" is the catchphrase of the moment, we should recognize that on the other side of discomfort lies pleasure. If pleasure is information, and for most people like me it is, then this is probably the most pleasurable moment ever. We will realize that we are not alone, that there are others. To me, this is actually a hopeful moment. If we are living on the edge of disaster and apocalypse just look at the zeitgeist of the moment; every other movie or television show is about an apocalypse, and I'm tired of them. Here we have a civilization that has made it past that inflection point, and they're...

[1:01:44 -> 1:02:34]

Speaker:

Here perhaps, if anything, only to show us that you can do it too.

[1:01:50]

Speaker:

How's that?

[1:01:51]

Speaker:
Beautiful.

[1:01:52]

Speaker:
Amazing.

[1:01:53]

Speaker:
what a great...

[1:01:54]

Speaker:
Amazing, yeah.

[1:01:55]

Speaker:
I can't believe what I just held in my hand.

[1:01:57]

Speaker:
Me too.

[1:01:58]

Speaker:
If true, this stuff came from unfathomable places in the universe.

[1:02:04]

Speaker:
And it's been years of collecting this stuff.

[1:02:06]

Speaker:
This is not something that I just found out. I've been collecting it for years.

[1:02:10]

Speaker:
One of my favorite characters that I've gotten to know in my studies is Dr. John Mack, who was chair of psychiatry at Harvard.

[1:02:15]

Speaker:
He's the one that inspired me.

[1:02:18]

Speaker:
His approach, because he was approaching it from a lens of empathy, and just really listening to those people that for their whole lives were just shut down in silence and told that they were crazy.

[1:02:27]

Speaker:

Like, why did we do that with our fellow humans?

[1:02:30]

Speaker:

Hundreds of thousands of them, if not millions of them, have shared stories, and we were like, "You're crazy."

[1:02:36 -> 1:03:41]

Speaker:

What was that? Like Melanie's story. I want to figure out what that is first before I try to ask the bigger questions. Stories have the power to change the world, and we just wanted to tell a story that is true to us a story that represents the inner journey of what I personally went through over the last three years, since it's been such a big part of my life that I never got to share.

One week after the hearing, especially with Melanie, there was always... Melanie is the one that I connected with on a personal level the most. I've been in touch with her over the past three years; we text back and forth. But she's the one that I was most curious about because she's the one that spoke about what happened to her the least. It wasn't a part of her... it didn't become a part of her story. That's why I think there's so much more to dig out.

I just saw this comment from the video in 2020: someone saying, "I went into this fully expecting to laugh and probably roll my eyes a good bit. Now I'm sitting here with chills, too scared of my new perception of reality to go to bed." It's exactly what people are expecting when they hear about UFOs and aliens that they're...

[1:03:44 -> 1:04:03]

Speaker:

I hope that a new perception of reality can be created, and hopefully not a fearful one, but rather an inviting and loving one. It requires a willingness to be open to a new understanding of reality. We can often be so closed off because we want to protect the world we've been conditioned by and the bubble we've created. If anything, I hope that people watching this will do so with an open mind, considering that it may be possible to expand the way they see this.

[1:04:03 -> 1:04:43]

Speaker:

Fashion icon.

- She really is.
- She's so cute.
- Yeah, she is.
- Sorry.
- No worries.
- How are you?
- So happy to see you.
- Was it hard to find you?
- No, no. It's super easy.

- Good to see you. It's been too long.
- And Sky, it's great that you came.
- Hey!
- Good to see you, my love.
- Good to see you too, honey.
- Well, welcome to the Berkshires.
- Welcome up to our house here.

[1:04:45 -> 1:05:49]

Speaker 1:

It feels so amazing to just be back and see her again. She's such a sweetheart. She was really my entry to this.

[1:04:52 -> 1:04:53]

Speaker 1:

Do you want to hold him?

[1:04:55 -> 1:04:55]

Speaker 2:

Yeah.

[1:04:56 -> 1:05:04]

Speaker 1:

Oh, lovely cat. Smells so good.

[1:05:09 -> 1:05:10]

Speaker 1:

He's shedding now.

[1:05:10 -> 1:05:14]

Speaker 1:

He's got a...

[1:05:14 -> 1:05:24]

Speaker 1:

So how was the trip? Just the whole journey of being with Dave from the moment he landed in Washington to us leaving together with him to go to his home.

[1:05:25 -> 1:05:29]

Speaker 2:

Sit, make yourself at home. When you're here, you have to make yourself at home.

[1:05:29 -> 1:05:39]

Speaker 1:

I could tell you how much I respected him because I could sense that there was a fear in him, but at the same time, he wasn't having it. He was determined to speak out. He said, "I'm going to tell this. I know that I've been through hell with this, what they've put me through, but I'm going to talk about it."

[1:05:39 -> 1:05:49]

Speaker 1:

I really am afraid for him at the same time.

[1:05:52 -> 1:06:51]

Speaker:

I'm afraid for him and his wife, but I really respect him. He's become the voice of people like me. You get it?

Interviewer:

Yeah, absolutely.

Speaker:

He knows the things that I can't talk about or the things that I saw. He knows what they're talking about. He's protecting someone like me who doesn't have a voice. I was beaten down as a child. It happened my whole life, but I was so beaten down as a child. So someone like him who comes forward and speaks about it, he's my hero. He is my hero.

Interviewer:

We're going to definitely let him know that.

Speaker:

Thanks for speaking to us.

Interviewer:

You too.

Speaker:

We love you.

Interviewer:

Bye, Melanie.

Speaker:

Speak soon.

Interviewer:

We will. What a woman.

Speaker:

Hey, what's up? We just left Melanie's home in the Berkshires, and there's something that I just needed to tell you right away. We asked her what the hearing meant to her.

[1:06:54 -> 1:07:47]

Speaker:

She just started tearing up. How you spoke gave her a voice and gave a voice to everyone who has gone through an experience like that. It was so emotional, and I wanted you to know that the people who have gone through these things are seeing you and appreciating you for what you've done. It was so beautiful to witness.

We left Melanie's with full hearts and hope for a future where more people can speak their truth without fear of being silenced. For me, this journey has been less about trying to figure out what the phenomenon is and more about why we failed to believe each other for so long.

Are you sorry now that you told people what you saw?

Yes, I am. I am sorry because it's not the truth, but it's just the idea the reaction of the people. They think you're a nut, to tell you the truth. That's just what they figure you are.

I hope that we've managed to spark your curiosity about the phenomenon

and deepen your empathy towards the humans who have risked it all to share their truth with the world.

[1:07:49 -> 1:09:14]

Speaker:

Let this be a moment where we choose love over fear, curiosity over skepticism. The human spirit has always sought to explore the unknown, and now we have to do just that. So let's come into it with an open mind and cultivate a deeper understanding of our existence on this beautiful planet. May this be a quest for truth, love, and humanity. I think that in space there's no love, and down here there is. There is love. Yes.

A Human Experience by Yes Theory.

Directed by Ammar Kandil.

In collaboration with Jesse Michels.

Director of Post Production: Thomas Dajer.

The highest form of knowledge is empathy.

Seek Discomfort.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ud_LiMOz83M

[00:00 -> 03:45]

Tucker Carlson:

Human beings have recorded seeing strange moving lights in the sky since the beginning of known history. The record goes back thousands of years. What is that? We don't know. In the United States, people have been talking a lot about these strange lights, UFOs, since the Second World War when military pilots recorded seeing things they called "Foo Fighters" out their cockpit windows. They had no idea what they were. For the last 80 years, it seems like there has been a continuous increase in the sightings of these UFOs or UAPs, and there's a whole industry that has grown up around describing what they may be. But it wasn't until very recently, within the last 18 months, that former government officials began stepping forward in public to say what they believe they are—people with direct firsthand knowledge of the government's interactions with these objects, vehicles, or people, or whatever they are. One such person who has come forward recently is a longtime military intelligence officer, an Air Force Major named David Grusch. He has made a number of very interesting claims in public, including during Congressional hearings. For example, here he is telling Congress that, in fact, the U.S. government has retrieved bodies, or as he puts it, "biologics," from crashed UAPs.

Do you believe that officials at the highest levels of our national security apparatus have unlawfully withheld information from Congress and subverted our oversight authority?

David Grusch:

There are certain elected leaders that had more information than I'm not sure what they've shared with certain Gang of Eight members, etc., but I certainly would not be surprised.

Tucker Carlson:

Okay, you've stated that the government is in possession of potentially nonhuman spacecraft. Based on your experience and extensive conversations with experts, do you believe our government has made contact with intelligent extraterrestrials?

David Grusch:

Something I can't discuss in a public setting.

Tucker Carlson:

Okay, I can't ask when you think this occurred. If you believe we have crashed craft, as you stated earlier, do we have the bodies of the pilots who piloted this craft?

David Grusch:

As I've stated publicly already in my News Nation interview, biologics came with some of these recoveries.

Tucker Carlson:

Were they, I guess, human or non-human biologics?

David Grusch:

Non-human, and that was the assessment of people with direct knowledge on the program I talked to who are currently still on the program.

Tucker Carlson:

And was this documented? Is there video, photos, eyewitness accounts? How would that be determined?

David Grusch:

The specific documentation I would have to talk to you about in a skiff.

Tucker Carlson:

Skiff being a secure location where the highest classified intelligence can be discussed among people who have permission to hear it.

David Grusch:

Dave Grusch is the man you just saw in that video. He joins us now. Thanks so much for coming on. So before you get into fleshing out some of what you told NCYM in that clip, tell us about your background. Who are you? Where are you from? What have you spent your life doing?

David Grusch:

Yeah, I spent my entire life growing up in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. I'm the son of a very normal income, typical family. I spent most of my youth playing basketball and tennis, and I ended up going to the University of Pittsburgh, where I went into Air Force ROTC. I had a full scholarship in physics at the time. Yeah, born and bred in Pittsburgh, and then once I graduated from Pitt, I ended up commissioning in the Air Force as a second lieutenant and went on active duty. I spent 14 years in the Air Force, both active duty and reserve. I also became a government civilian at the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency.

[03:47 -> 07:25]

David Grusch:

I was brought in at the GS-15 level, which is equivalent to a full bird colonel. I worked at the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency on MacArthur Boulevard in DC, which is actually in Springfield, Virginia. That agency collects all imagery and other types of visual intelligence to create fused products known as geospatial intelligence products. Think about the National Reconnaissance Office; they fly the satellites. The National Geospatial Intelligence Agency processes that intelligence.

So, if there's something floating above the Earth, it's their job to know about it and process the intelligence coming from satellites orbiting the planet. I spent over 14 years in this field, and then suddenly, the public encounters me saying that the US government has very detailed knowledge of what these unidentified flying objects are and has had this knowledge for a long time.

I had no personal interest in the UFO subject. I grew up seeing things

on the History Channel, but having studied physics and become an intelligence officer, I was quite agnostic about the topic. I was in a position of extreme trust; I handled the Presidential Daily Brief for my agency's director at the National Reconnaissance Office when I was an Air Force Reserve officer. I was widely cleared for most black programs in the Department of Defense.

A black program refers to a special access program. I figured I would know if such a program existed. It was a running joke among my colleagues and me, wondering when we would get read into the UFO stuff, as we thought it was a total joke. However, that changed when I saw the New York Times article in 2017.

That article was about Lou Elizondo and other individuals who ran the Advanced Aerospace Threat Identification Program (AATIP) and the Advanced Systems Applications Program (ASAP). To be clear, I think the government has never admitted or denied that Elizondo was involved. He certainly was. I remember briefing a very senior official in a meeting about a couple of hundred special access programs because, at the time, I was a trusted individual advising the Joint Chiefs on certain black programs.

I recall a co-worker of Lou Elizondo mentioning that there was a guy named Elizondo over at the Pentagon running some UFO program and that we thought he had lost his mind. He was giving the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence a hard time. This was six months prior to the Leslie Kean and Ralph Blumenthal article in December 2017. I didn't know who this Lou guy was; he sounded crazy to me because I was unaware of any UFO program.

Little did I know that about six or seven months later, I saw that on the news, and it caught my attention because I had heard about this guy. I didn't realize that the program was real, but it turned out it was. I spent a year conducting an open-source literature review, and then in early 2019, by happenstance, my boss forwarded me an email from the UAP Task Force director asking if we could provide a representative from the NRO to help the task force. My boss knew I was a reservist and was looking for something to add to my performance report, so of course, I said yes.

[07:28 -> 11:08]

David Grusch:

I figured I would determine whether it was something prosaic, like a natural phenomenon, or if it was a U.S. program that people are seeing, which they think is a UFO but isn't. Alternatively, it could be some adversarial program that our intelligence community may have missed in their analysis. So, I went in with an open mind. I was open to the idea of non-human intelligence because, as someone who has a bachelor's degree in physics, I am aware of the Drake equation, which calculates the number of potential civilizations in the Milky Way based on certain factors. People can Google that and explore it themselves. I was open to the possibility, but I didn't think that would be the answer.

So, you were detailed to this?

Yes, it was my official duty as an Air Force officer. Eventually, when the NGA hired me as a government civilian, the UAP portfolio came to me and a few other individuals within our agency to support the UAP task force. Initially, that office transitioned to the Arrow Office, the All Domain Anomaly Resolution Office.

By this point, you had worked in the government for a long time?

Yes, I had. If you count my time as a cadet in uniform, I've been in uniform for 18 years.

How was this different?

This was different because I started to uncover some very disturbing facts. I had people come to me, and I had access to the classified archives from previous UFO programs that Lou Elizondo and others ran years prior. I read some extremely interesting foreign intelligence derived from clandestine human sources overseas, exposing something notable about the U.S. They indicated that the U.S. has a retrieval and reverse engineering program. I thought, "whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa." This was the assessment of other countries.

Other countries?

Yes, and by the way, I ran all this through DOD security and pre-publication review. I want to emphasize that I am a steward of security. I care about national security and would never want to say something publicly that could hamper it. Just to put that out there, it was fascinating to discover that I was reading the assessments of countries that are spying on us, and we have spied on their assessments of us.

Yes, and I had a chain of custody on how we obtained that information. I thought, "Maybe this is passage material." We had to be very careful, as passage material could be a form of disinformation intended to trick a case officer into developing a relationship with a specific asset. I wondered if this was true. A certain adversary of ours apparently thinks it is true. One thing led to another, and I spoke with extremely senior officials, including former directors of certain agencies. I had the privilege of having relationships with them, and I discussed this issue with them. They confirmed those details.

What was really interesting in the previous UFO program records, specifically the AATIP program, which ran roughly from 2008 to 2010, was that it was under the Defense Intelligence Agency. This has been released through FOIA, and you can actually go to the DIA's website to read this. The paperwork included a very odd request from Senator Harry Reid, who sent a letter to the Deputy Secretary of Defense asking for something called a...

[11:11 -> 15:03]

David Grusch:

I've never seen in my career a member of Congress ask the Department of Defense to develop a very classified program. Usually, it's the reverse; Congress wants more transparency and classification. I'm

like, this is very unusual. I don't know what's going on here. Why is Harry Reid saying that the AATIP program found something they needed to develop this provisional special access program?

This is a waved and bigoted program, which is the most serious of special access programs. "Waved" means it's limited congressionally reported under 10 U.S. Code Section 119, and "bigoted" means it's by name, and there was a list of individuals that needed to be briefed. Of course, Senator Reid and a couple of members of the Gang of Eight wanted to be on it.

So, I asked people who both worked on that program and those who were tangential to it, who worked in certain intelligence agencies, what this was about. Well, you know, a certain clear defense contractor wanted to transfer some of their material holdings to the DIA for our program. It was all crash retrieval material, and this was a way to horizontally protect, as we call it, that information and that physical material from a certain other government program and custodian that lent that contractor material in the past.

I was like, wait, are you saying we have UFO material? That's crazy! Are you sure it's UFO material? This isn't like we went and got wreckage from a Russian bomber that just happened to be weird or something like that. And no, they were dead serious.

So, what was their tone or effect when they said this? Well, they certainly seemed a little jaded. The real reality to them is not shocking, but I was so intrigued by this. Not only did I interview ten people who were in the meetings and talked to the clear defense contractor, but I was also involved in trying to persuade the government customer to release custodianship to ultimately give it to the DIA in Bigelow Aerospace.

I actually flew to Las Vegas and met with Senator Harry Reid himself after he retired, of course, the former Majority Leader. I wanted to hear it right from his mouth, as he had a long-standing interest in this topic. He confirmed to me that he was told this clear defense contractor had material, and this was the way to get it. He told me that he knew that contractor had material for decades; however, the Pentagon has always denied him access to actually see that. He literally told me that in his living room to my face.

If I can just ask you to pause, how could the Pentagon, which has no authority of any kind except to the extent it serves elected officials—it's not its own country—deny an elected official access to something?

Yeah, and that's part of why I whistleblow. Right there, a constitutional government overreach is exactly so. Elected leaders, even in the normal black program community, are treated as second-class citizens. "Oh, we're going to waive reporting." I can sign an order saying we're not going to fully brief certain committees on seen programs. That is in public law, 10 U.S. Code Section 119, and that is congressional oversight of special access programs.

But the department, which I find very weird in retrospect, where you know the legislators authorize and...

[15:06 -> 18:44]

Tucker Carlson:

It's appropriate that these programs are being discussed, but they're not afforded full access. Occasionally, the Gang of Eight will receive those kinds of briefings. But literally, they could withhold information, you know, besides notifying a program that stood up the entire Congress about some kind of clandestine activity. It's almost unbelievable. They have no moral authority to do that, of course, under our Constitution.

David Grusch:

Yeah, and you know, can I ask? I don't want to get caught up in this because it's the least interesting part, but I think it is significant. What about the executive? Do you believe they withheld information from sitting presidents?

Tucker Carlson:

It's funny you ask that. The executive was initially involved in the secrecy surrounding the UAP topic. They transposed the Manhattan Project secrecy construct onto this. Eventually, they formed the Atomic Energy Act, specifically the McMahon Act of 1946 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. They purposely diluted the definition of special nuclear material. If you actually read Section 51 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, it states that besides normal nuclear material, we can also protect material that is similar. It's a very broad definition, and that's basically the justification for the secrecy on this topic. The material we recover sometimes does have radioactive properties, and they legally and gymnastically twisted public law to justify the secrecy.

David Grusch:

I have so many questions for you, and I'm getting in the way of your narrative, which is terrific. Thank you. So, before I interrupted you, you were saying that you all of a sudden realized this is real.

Tucker Carlson:

And then it sounds like you said you interviewed ten people. It sounds like you decided to find out as much as you could.

David Grusch:

Yeah, we interviewed roughly 40 people, many of whom had firsthand knowledge. Like I said, we were privileged to interview people at the same level as Harry Reid, for example. Harry was just so concerned about this topic. When I left the meeting with him, he said he was going to talk to President Biden. He and President Biden had a weekly call, and this was about nine months before his death. Certainly, his mind was sharp, but he was struggling with health issues for sure. He was so concerned about our conversation, which was unclassified because I was in his living room. He was going to talk to the president because he understood that even he, as a Gang of Eight

member and the majority leader, was denied access.

Tucker Carlson:

Going back to your earlier question about presidents, many administrations ago, a lot of the presidents were in the dark. However, it has vacillated over the years, where certain Chief Executives aren't necessarily briefed on all aspects of the program. You have a Commander-in-Chief who is also our chief diplomat, and they need to know if there is a foreign entity—adversary or friend—out there so they can form foreign policy for the country. But when you are not telling them, it's like classifying the existence of Russia. They have no moral authority to do it. They have no authority to even have their jobs without the authority that comes from the votes of the population through the elected officials.

David Grusch:

That's the issue. It's a symptom of the over-classification of this whole secret National Security State that was formed in 1947. They're basically classifying basic physics.

[18:46 -> 22:34]

Tucker Carlson:

Astrobiology, that kind of stuff. Do we classify nuclear physics? No, you can study it at university. So, since I keep interrupting, let's just go to the beginning. Tell us what you know about the genesis of this. I'll start with the most obvious question, which is: you said the secrecy surrounding these programs derived from the secrecy surrounding the Manhattan Project. Is there any connection between the two?

David Grusch:

Not overtly, but certainly during the Manhattan Project.

Tucker Carlson:

More specifically, do you think that the development of nuclear weapons was derived in any way from technology from these?

David Grusch:

No, no, no, no. I think that was totally independent. But I think it might have precipitated interest from these objects.

Tucker Carlson:

From these objects?

David Grusch:

Yes. Okay, so the most famous, obviously, is Roswell in 1947.

Tucker Carlson:

Yeah, I can't talk about many retrievals. The only one I've stated publicly is the 1933 Italian event. So tell us what that is.

David Grusch:

I picked that event specifically because it was not U.S.-centric, and I wanted to expose that this is a worldwide problem, not just a

U.S.-centric problem. That was a recovery of an artifact by the Axis powers, Italy and Germany, in 1933. Much of that information, ironically, was in the public vernacular starting in the early 2000s. There were certain researchers in Italy who uncovered these documents that Mussolini sent to the equivalent of the Gestapo. However, that was one specific recovery that was briefed to me by a senior intelligence officer.

Tucker Carlson:

Well, I mean, since it was 90 years ago in fascist Italy, I think we're safe in telling what we know, correct?

David Grusch:

Yeah, so what happened? They recovered this object. It looked like an acorn, and the intelligence officer that briefed me—let's just say senior officials on Capitol Hill—described how the edges of this object were like a lenticular disc, but the edges broke off when it hit the Earth. So it looked like an acorn or like a bell shape. When they recovered it, it was just an artifact; they didn't find anything with it. The Italians kept custody of that towards the end of the war, and then the Americans came in and recovered it. We knew about it because it turns out the Vatican, through Pope Pius XII and the OSS, sent a communication back to FDR saying, "We got something kind of weird that crashed in Italy." This history is longer than most people think. It's not just those seminal events that you may have mentioned to me; it actually goes back much farther. I wanted to use 1933 as an example not only to garner international interest but to explain that this is a longer activity than most people think.

Tucker Carlson:

So, what you're saying is, even after Italy falls in 1945, the Mussolini government and the U.S. military swoop in and take this?

David Grusch:

Yes.

Tucker Carlson:

And then it disappears behind the veil of secrecy. why?

David Grusch:

They were secretive about it even then.

Tucker Carlson:

How come?

David Grusch:

It was one of those things—it's like a Pandora's box. If you could analyze it and garner some kind of information from it, from a reverse engineering perspective, it may give you an ace in the hole, an asymmetric advantage over your adversary. We wanted to figure this out; we didn't know if Russia had ever found any of this stuff at the time. And, of course, they didn't know the origin of it.

[22:36 -> 26:27]

Tucker Carlson:

They just wanted to make sure it wasn't one of our adversaries, so they spent years looking at it and developing an intelligence infrastructure to figure out what was going on. Is that the first that you know of?

David Grusch:

No, but that was one of the ones I ran through DOD security.

Tucker Carlson:

So you believe there are earlier incidents?

David Grusch:

I don't want to comment either way. Yeah, I know about many other events, but that's the only one that I've cleared through security.

Tucker Carlson:

Okay, but you can say for at least the last 80 years, the U.S. government has...

David Grusch:

Yeah, at least from 1933, which is about 90 or so, if I'm doing the math right. But you said the U.S. government didn't take custody until the end of the war?

David Grusch:

That particular one, yes.

Tucker Carlson:

Okay, but you are saying the U.S. government had knowledge in the '30s? They were aware of the issue back then?

David Grusch:

Yeah.

Tucker Carlson:

Wow. Huh. Um, stupid question, but one that keeps occurring to me: why would advanced technology like this crash so often?

David Grusch:

Yeah, people ask that. I think one of the tropes that a lot of skeptics put out is, "Oh, it traveled so far; why did it crash? Did it crash by accident or on purpose?" There's something called the concept of von Neumann replicating probes, which you can Google. A physicist postulated that if you're advanced, you might have throwaway probes. I mean, think of the Voyager spacecraft, for example. Right? We don't care what the disposition is at the end; we just wanted to go as far as possible. So the crashes aren't necessarily on purpose, and I'm not just saying that as my own personal theory. You know, I talk to scientists who were on this program, and this was one of their legitimate theories. That is a possibility.

Tucker Carlson:

But you say these subjects came from so far. Do we know that?

David Grusch:

well, that's the thing; you don't really know the origin. You know, even certain directors of government agencies we talked to about this issue were well aware of this program. They like to use the term "extraterrestrial," but I'm a little skeptical about that. That's why I like to use the term "NHI," which stands for non-human intelligence. That is also a term that Chuck Schumer, in the Schumer Amendment, used. You know, Chuck Schumer, Senator Gillibrand, Rubio, Rounds, and Young proposed an act called the UAP Disclosure Act of 2023. It's an amendment within the fiscal year 2024 National Defense Authorization Act—67 pages publicly available. It is currently in conference right now, and they use the term "non-human intelligence biologic." So, I'm not the only one using those terms; that is the majority leader Chuck Schumer, who, by the way, was friends with Harry Reid. Other notable senators are also pushing for transparency in this matter.

Tucker Carlson:

Is there any evidence that these objects are coming from far away through space into our atmosphere?

David Grusch:

That touches some sensitive national technical capabilities I can't cross, but it sounds like there's some suggestion that they are coming from under the ocean. I think it's a multi-domain issue, and there are a bunch of potential origins that are based either in physics theory or biological theory. You know, I'm open to all possibilities.

Tucker Carlson:

Is it known so far, as you know, where they come from?

David Grusch:

There are reasonably confident theories; however, I have not seen all the data, and I don't always trust everything certain interview subjects expose because I might have an intellectual or data analytical kind of difference in opinion. But I do encourage the president, and through this act, to make all data as it relates to origin transparent to the American people.

Tucker Carlson:

well, that's... I mean, if...

[26:29 -> 29:59]

Tucker Carlson:

If you can't even say it now, there's... and I want to get into that—like, why the secrecy? Actually, well, that's the problem. It's hindering national security by keeping it so tight because you don't have a broad industrial base and broad academic study. Just like nuclear physics, you can go and get a PhD in it; you can read about it, you can study it. How you build nuclear weapons—that's classified, and that's fine. I just want this subject to be basically horizontally protected like nuclear secrets—like true nuclear secrets—where the broad study of which should be open to the public. Anything that is really dangerous to release because of weaponization or something

should be kept classified, but 95% should be open to study throughout the world.

Especially since it sounds pretty clear that the U.S. government has been in contact with whatever these are. You wouldn't confirm or deny that in your congressional testimony; it seems very clear to me. I won't ask you because you've already answered it, but you know that's being done in the name of the U.S. taxpayer, citizens, and voters. At some point, they have a right to know that. I can't imagine what the justification for keeping that from the public—who you work for—could be. What could that be?

David Grusch:

I think it's an abuse. You know, Executive Order 13526, if you read that, delineates the eight reasons you classify information. The only thing that this falls under is scientific and technical information that has national security implications. It's this boilerplate, and it's really just an abuse at this point. We are over-classifying things out of fear of the socioeconomic, theological, and counterintelligence implications.

I remember talking to a former director of a three-letter agency that we happen to know personally, and we met with him. You know, that former director's biggest issue was the counterintelligence implications. We can't let Russia and China figure this out. Okay, I get that. I used to work counterintelligence to protect U.S. programs in a previous job when I was a young Air Force officer. But there's got to be middle ground—not, "Oh, well, we don't know what to do, so we're just going to keep everything unacknowledged." It's ridiculous.

But it also suggests that there's more going on here. I mean, in your own life, or my life, or the life of any person, the things that you hide—the things you try to keep secret the most assiduously—are the things you're most embarrassed about. That is true.

There was a recent administration that had an informal off-site meeting, and I talked to multiple individuals who were in this meeting with, let's just say, National Security Council staff of this former administration. One of the biggest issues they raised was white-collar crime and illegal contracting. There's something called the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), and if you only give a couple of contractors full access for decades to this stuff and you don't let other contractors compete for work, you're giving certain companies an unfair competitive advantage that violates literal U.S. law.

So, you know, we're not going to release anything because then we have to deal with... and I remember these individuals telling me they were worried that contractors would sue the U.S. government, and it would be litigated to the Supreme Court. Well, we're out of billions because you sole-sourced it to these couple of companies.

[30:01 -> 33:39]

David Grusch:

There are darker explanations and darker things, I'm sure. But some of

the most obvious ones that they told me were very rudimentary. It's like, well, yeah, I'm sorry you guys did that. And let's be clear, I'm not here to admonish the entire U.S. government. I mean, I know a lot of good people. I would like to think I was a good person, a good intelligence officer. Well, I'm the son of a federal employee; you don't need to convince me, I know. So I'm not here to overly admonish everybody. I think there needs to be, you know, a call it a Truth and Reconciliation process. We're not here to shackle people; we're not here to get people necessarily in trouble unless they did something grossly illegal, immoral, or unethical. I suspect, based on the people I talked to, there are going to be limited situations where people are found culpable in that. But I'm here to say, you know, it's time to reconcile this. We need to heal from this. We need to disclose the basics—the fact that we're not alone, we've recovered material, and we've recovered the occupants. Beyond that, you know, the president can decide what should be disclosed; that's above my pay grade. But the basics should be acknowledged, and I think it's a more ontologically shocking but also uniting thing in an era of divisiveness. I think we need this. I agree with that. I mean, what else is going to unite the left, the right, and potential adversaries? I mean, you saw the hearing that you played the clip of; I had AOC and Matt Gaetz agreeing on something in the same room and not arguing. It was crazy. So this topic, I think, is maybe we're at a point in our society, especially given the decay we've seen over the last 30 years and the divisiveness, whether you're on the left or on the right. This is the one topic that I think can basically be a reset button. So can you just give us a sense of the scale of these recoveries? Is it three, or is it double digits? I have mentioned that publicly; I am familiar with the exact numbers. We had multiple intel officers brief us on all the numbers and where, what, when, where, and how all the stuff is kept. I mean, I assume I do know of some specific locations—warehouses. Yeah, I mean, Harry Reid knew about one specific location, and that was the material that he was denied access to. Why didn't he show up with armed guards and demand to see it? I don't understand; everyone's so passive. Yeah, you're the Senate Majority Leader; show it to me now. You would think that there's some kind of enforcement tactic he could have used, and he didn't. Anything else besides that he was trying to get access administratively by sponsoring that special access program? So that kind of raises an interesting point. Having spent my life in Washington, you know, you hear this stuff, but you don't really know if it's true. You know about unauthorized and dark things going on in the United States to people who tell its secrets. But it does raise the question: why? It's been going on for, well, you said, I guess, 90 years at least. You're suggesting longer, actually. But certainly most of a century, and no one's really come forward. Why is that? Yeah, I mean, there have been other people that have come forward. Certainly, it was more stigmatized in the past. Why me? I was just a guy in the right place at the right time. I happened to be ultra-cleared in the DOD and IC at the time, and I generally knew who to talk to and where the skeletons were for other U.S. activities. But what's your motive? My motive really is just, you know, Air Force core values: service before self, integrity first. And I just did not want...

[33:41 -> 37:25]

David Grusch:

You know, I look back 30 years from now and think, "I should have done something" when this topic was acceptable in Congress. We had all this momentum. I just did not want to live out my life keeping the secret like these other gentlemen and ladies who came to me and my group on the UAP task force because they wanted change. Some of them were in tears because they had been threatened over the years.

Tucker Carlson:

Threatened by whom?

David Grusch:

Both the program and others. You can imagine, they would say, "Hey, we're going to read you in. This is treason. You will go to Leavenworth, and you will be executed if you ever divulge these secrets." They were intimidated.

Tucker Carlson:

Have fun at trial.

David Grusch:

Well, the judicial process doesn't quite work the same in that program. But that's the sensitivity. They don't have context. Why does someone just tear down the U.S. government? This is so rotten that it's hard to believe it actually exists. I lost a lot of sleep over this. When I started getting attacked from the inside and the reprisals began for three years, I knew I was over the target, so to speak. You take fire when you're over the target, as we say in the Air Force. It just got so crazy. I had three agencies investigate me at the same time.

Tucker Carlson:

Which ones?

David Grusch:

I don't want to say because there's an ongoing reprisal investigation on my behalf by the Inspector General to look into all this that's going on. I don't want to compromise that investigation by revealing too many details. But I was investigated by three agencies at once. They tried to dig up anything they could find on me. They even tried to use mental health issues I reported in my past. I've been to Afghanistan; I have PTSD and a VA disability rating because of that. I had a friend who was killed and another who took his own life, which impacted me when I was in my twenties. But I got help—no problem. I maintained my clearance.

Tucker Carlson:

So they dug up stuff from almost a decade ago?

David Grusch:

Yes, they claimed I had ongoing issues, which was certainly not the case. I was taking care of myself. I have high-functioning autism, and I had to learn how to manage my emotions to maintain my clearance.

when that didn't work, they just made up stuff. It turns out I found out after the fact that I was under criminal investigation for four months. I was never interviewed; I didn't even know what it was about. Then I found out afterward when they tried to use that to revoke my clearance.

Tucker Carlson:
That sounds alarming.

David Grusch:
Mind you, I have a good attorney, the former Inspector General, and we litigated that. We rebutted their claims, and I was cleared of any wrongdoing. I maintained my clearance and resigned from NGA with my clearance eligibility intact. But I even FOIA'd that agency, which put me under criminal investigation, and I received a denial of my whole file, citing something called a B7 Alpha FOIA exemption, which means it could compromise a law enforcement investigation. They wouldn't even give me anything—not even redacted papers. They just sent me a denial letter.

Tucker Carlson:
That's unbelievable.

David Grusch:
Exactly. They said I did something bad, which wasn't even true. They never interviewed me, and they were trying to use that information to fire me. That's crazy. Luckily, there is an open investigation to look into this kind of wrongdoing, and that's one of the reasons I went public. I'm a patriot; I shouldn't be treated like this. If there was a sensitive program I uncovered, come to the table with me. Tell me to knock it off. Where's everybody else? Where has everyone been for the last 90 years? It's so outrageous that it suggests to me the threats you alluded to.

[37:28 -> 41:03]

David Grusch:
People are afraid of being hurt, and luckily, people are coming out. Remember the DIA asset program I mentioned earlier? A man named Dr. James Latsky ran it; he's a PhD-level former DIA officer now retired. He wrote two books, one of which is called "Skinwalkers at the Pentagon." On pages 152 to 153, if anyone is watching and happens to have the book, you'll note that they talked about sequestered technology and their attempts to gain access to it. That's what I just told you earlier in this interview: Harry Reid was literally trying to get them access to that technology.

You know, people say, "Oh, well, Harry was funding some paranormal program; they were looking at Skinwalker Ranch; it was some woo-woo thing." But the real story is that the \$21 or \$22 million appropriated was meant to set up material analysis equipment at a Bigelow Aerospace facility to examine the material that a clear defense contractor was supposed to transfer to them. However, when that ended, they ended up using that money for other purposes because they wanted to study this phenomenon in some way, shape, or form. So, they looked at some of the

more paranormal aspects, if you will.

I've never been to Skinwalker Ranch in Utah, but allegedly, things are happening out there. They wrote these documents called Defense Intelligence Reference Documents in lieu of what the core reason for that money was. A lot of naysayers on social media say, "Oh, Harry Reid was just into the paranormal, and he wanted to study Skinwalker Ranch ghosts." That's not entirely accurate; there was a real reason for it.

But I'm just saying what they're doing is similar to what it sounds like they did to you, which is trying to discredit you by calling you a nut. One week after the Congressional hearing, there was a hit piece on The Intercept. Someone verbally tipped off that reporter, and he admitted it in an interview on The Hill. He filed for some records that pointed towards some struggles I had several years ago when I checked myself into a hospital because I was feeling depressed. I'm not ashamed of that; a lot of veterans go through that.

But it was very interesting that one week after the hearing, this hit piece came out in The Intercept, killing the messenger but not the message. They were saying I'm crazy and have mental problems. Why would an Intercept reporter do that? You would think they were pro-whistleblower. Didn't Glenn Greenwald create them to support whistleblowers? If some high-level bureaucrat comes to you to crush a subordinate because he's revealing things that the public has a right to know, you would think they would report, "Actually, I want to hear more about the program. Do you have UFOs or not?"

It's like, why don't you actually look into it? It's very lazy journalism, and there are very few investigative journalists left, as I'm sure you know. I'm very aware of that. But I just want to get back to the core of what's going on here; it doesn't actually add up. The idea is that for 90 years, we've been collecting this information, monitoring it, and studying it to improve military technology and give us an edge. There were certainly good breakthroughs that I'm aware of that helped certain black programs that are conventional in nature.

Can you be more detailed about any of that?

No, I can't; a lot of those programs are still classified.

[41:05 -> 44:59]

Tucker Carlson:

The point I'm making is that a lot of these programs are so old that no person who participated in them is still alive. That was the issue; I had to find some of the old-timers before they died because there's a brain drain. I have a senior intelligence officer who is currently on the program that told us they have trouble hiring even the right technical people because of the security clearance requirements. Imagine the best person in quantum gravity smokes marijuana—are they getting a Top Secret clearance? No. So they can't even bring in the right people. And once again, like you just said, a lot of the breakthroughs have not matriculated into civil society for the most part.

In an era of climate change and other pressing issues, we can debate the genesis of those problems, but this is the time to bring it out because it's going to take 20 to 30 years to commercialize anything anyway. It does suggest that there's something more going on here. It suggests that the U.S. government has kept the Kennedy assassination files—thousands of pages classified—for 60 years this month because the CIA, of course, was in contact with Oswald and had knowledge of the conspiracy to kill Kennedy. I'm not speculating; I talked to someone who read the documents. They have hidden those documents to protect themselves from public scrutiny of their own illegal behavior.

I would be surprised if something similar is not going on here. There's a famous quote from a John Stossel interview where he interviews Mike Pompeo about two or three years ago. Interestingly, he makes a very odd assertion after discussing the JFK files. He says, if I get this quote correctly, "I've seen the UFO file; we have bigger problems," is what the former CIA director says to John Stossel in a taped interview.

If you even go back, most people don't know this, there's a taped interview from Senator Barry Goldwater in the late 80s. He was famously a two-star general in the Air Force Reserve, but Goldwater was well-known in the 80s. There's an interview of him that you can find on YouTube. He phoned General Curtis LeMay many years ago and asked, "Hey, I heard there's a room where you keep all this UFO material. Can I have access?" General LeMay basically chewed out Senator Goldwater, who was a member of the Gang of Eight at the time, and denied him access.

So there's something wrong when certain people like that try to dig into it. But there's a reason they're keeping it secret. There may be other reasons; I don't claim to be omnipotent and know all the issues, and that's why I'm not here to close this. This should be the president of the United States and his cabinet because there may be issues that I'm not even aware of that could precipitate a certain form of acknowledgment or disclosure. I do agree there is probably something darker, deeper, and more disturbing, and I saw inklings of that when I interviewed so many people of high caliber.

So what is the truth about these claims of abduction? I don't know. Nobody I interviewed had any firsthand knowledge of that phenomenon. I certainly believe people have experienced things like that—at least they believe it—because you look at Dr. John Mack, who was a Harvard-trained psychologist and psychiatrist. He looked at the phenomenon of abduction in the 90s and early 2000s before his death, and he affirmed that the people he psychoanalyzed certainly experienced something real to them. But what is the abduction phenomenon? I really don't know. I'm not sure. Are you? Is there any...

[45:01 -> 48:59]
Tucker Carlson:

Indications suggest that the U.S. government has studied this. I would imagine that a part of the program I uncovered probably analyzed that situation because it is data-data even if it's, you know, oral testimony. But I really don't know. Do you think... I've read a couple of reports, not just in this country but from others, where former government officials say they believe there's some spiritual connection to these phenomena.

David Grusch:

well, I think if you were to back out to the 100,000-foot level, there certainly is a phenomenon. How do we quantify that? Theologically, we can quantify that as, you know, angels and demons, that kind of thing. Many people with religious belief systems have faith in that regard, and they believe that a phenomenon exists. What we're seeing here with the UFO and UAP subject is probably just another facet of that same phenomenon. So, I think this is not something that's going to destroy belief systems. Even the Vatican's chief astronomer in 2009 or 2010 said the Vatican is okay with non-human intelligence; it doesn't hurt Catholic theology. The Vatican maintains an observatory, I believe, in the Rome area, but I'm not an expert on the Vatican. I could be mistaken.

Tucker Carlson:

I'm not either. Do other countries have these materials?

David Grusch:

what I said in my initial interview with News Nation is that it ultimately became a Cold war arms race, sub rosa, under the noise floor. Other countries do have their own programs, and I can't get into those details because that's something I did not put through security review. However, I will point out that the South China Morning Post, in June 2021, published an article stating, "Oh yeah, we have a UAP task force too, and we're using artificial intelligence to analyze UAPs." But other than that public announcement, our adversaries have kept their mouths shut on this issue for the most part.

Tucker Carlson:

Technology, aircraft technology, has not actually progressed very far, has it?

David Grusch:

No, we've plateaued for many, many years. The bypass fan was designed, I think, by H.L. in the late '30s. And that's also my issue, right? You know, I'm 36; I represent kind of the under-40 generation. Where's our ASM total leap? Where's the next propulsion? We're stuck. If people care about carbon neutrality and green energy, well, if we have something that's only being studied for military purposes, that may unlock the next level of either energy or propulsion, I don't know. We should be openly studying this at this point because look what's happening to the planet.

Tucker Carlson:

So, that suggests what? That military contractors are incompetent?

That it's so compartmentalized it can't...

David Grusch:

But our military aircraft haven't progressed to some crazy level either, obviously, at least based on what the public knows. However, we've had multi-star generals that we talk to, both current and former, who say that this program is just, you know, the Wild West in some sense. There are all these silos of activity; there's no monolithic director of all these activities. It just became this uncontrolled, unmanaged black abyss of looking into this. It's so disjointed that people aren't even talking to each other, and it's very similar to the special access programs I saw. So, this is really not that shocking to me. There were times when I was working on...

[49:01 -> 50:40]

David Grusch:

There's a certain intelligence community program that's compartmented, and I see what they're doing. I'm like, "You do know the Department of Defense already has that, right?" Then I would have to get them cross-briefed, and this is just a symptom of that same ecosystem. We've seen this for a long time; it's just too big. Well, the Department of Defense, I saw their audit came out yesterday, and they couldn't account for 50% of their assets. Try that on your tax return. Their financial management system has been on the GAO's watch list since 1995, and I think I read in an article in The Hill that they spend \$5 billion a year on financial management software.

So when I hear that the SEF doesn't know anything about a program, well, you can't even account for \$3.8 trillion of your own assets. How do you know what the department actually has without ordering an investigation? No, that's exactly right.

At what point will this become public? I'm glad you asked that. I mentioned the Schumer Amendment, the UAP Disclosure Act of 2023. It's currently in conference; it's part of the fiscal year 2024 National Defense Authorization Act, which funds the DOD and IC. But right now, it's in a perilous position because, as I'm told by staffers on the Hill, the House Armed Services and Intelligence Committees are trying to block it, specifically Mike Rogers and Mike Turner. They believe it's duplicative and that it's not going to assist Arrow in any way. However, having Mike Rogers and Mike Turner involved is concerning.

The thing is, this provides two of the dumbest people in Washington with pure tools at the National Security level. It helps them give top cover; it helps them declassify things. You know, Mike Turner—do you know who his biggest donors are? He represents the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base district, and his biggest donors are Lockheed Martin and Boeing. It's a shameful career.

Well, it's very interesting because his committee, the House Intel Committee, is precisely the committee I gave multiple hours of classified testimony to last year. But Mike Turner seems to just go on Fox Business after the Congressional hearing and say, without using my name, that "the whistleblower doesn't know what he's talking about;

there's nothing to see here." I'm like, really, Mike Turner? The mayor of Dayton for many years—were you ever in the intelligence community? Were you ever a military officer? Have you ever handled special access program material for 14 years? Oh, I have. Why didn't you call me into your office if you thought my testimony was incomplete? I mean, the guy shouldn't even be reelected.

Did you know that Mike Turner is trying to hurt Tim Burchett's reelection in Tennessee? He's trying to fund an opposing candidate because Tim Burchett is one of the leading Republican UAP proponents in the House. He's taken it upon himself not only to try to block the Schumer amendments but also to ruin Representative Burchett's reelection chances because he's speaking out too much about this issue. He is basically defaming me and discrediting me on national TV.

I'm sorry, Representative Turner, you have no idea what you're talking about. If you want me to think he probably does, he's just lying, or he does. Of course, he's carrying water for people who don't want the public to know what's going on, and Lockheed has his ear. So, I'm a private citizen; I can be critical of my elected officials, and I encourage their constituents, both Mike Rogers and Mike Turner, to call their offices and say, "We do not want this bill to be blocked." Because if this bill gets signed into law, President Biden signs this...

[52:41 -> 56:17]

Tucker Carlson:

The House is okay with this amendment. You don't think Chuck Schumer called the president or the national security adviser before proposing this legislation? Of course he did, right? This allows for basically a six-year process because it forms a panel of experts—a person panel. There's an economist, a scientist, a lawyer; I mean, it's what you would expect. This was modeled off the JFK Records Act of '92, the one they keep ignoring. But we added some teeth to it to try to get this all the way through. This sets up a presidential panel and an associated agency to assist Arrow and other parts of the executive branch to come up with a literal disclosure plan. I encourage people to read the amendment; it is obvious if you read it that we're talking about non-human technology, non-human biologics, and we're discussing the disclosure of these facts in an honest way by the chief executive if this passes.

If this doesn't pass, I mean, this is probably the most important law in U.S. history, let's be real. If this doesn't pass and it's successfully blocked by the House, I mean, it's a total disaster. Well, it's also, I mean, we're bumping up against criminal behavior at some point. So it's like, why wouldn't people just do what generations of whistleblowers have done and leak the material to the public? I never wanted to be like that. I always follow the rules; I color in the lines. Anything I talk about publicly that's sensitive, I literally make sure I can say that from a security perspective. Because think about it: there are foreign intelligence services watching this interview right now. I am not here to hurt national security; however, I am here as a fact witness because we have an

oversight issue, and I want things to change. My generation wants things to change, and for all the reasons I've enumerated earlier, they are self-evident.

This is a question about a topic that cannot be classified because it is illegal. But do you have any reason to believe that the U.S. government has hurt or killed anybody connected to these programs—American citizens? There were concerns, like I stated during the hearing, from people who have expressed that to me. Of course, I brought some of those officers to the Inspector General, the Intelligence Community Inspector General, because I'm like, this is serious. I'm like, here are the law enforcement people you want to talk to because I'm hands-off. If that's true, you need to look into it. But the allegation was murder—yes, and then physical harm. I will say, well, I won't get into the specifics because it's part of my open investigation. You know, besides the administrative stuff, I don't know; it's an unknown entity to me. I do not know who did this, but their displeasure in me was made known in my personal life, and it affected my wife and me. I had to report that to a certain counterintelligence element and a certain law enforcement element because right before I filed my whistleblower complaint, I felt that my life was in jeopardy. That's what I was alluding to during the hearing.

Because, you know, we'll just say, when you come home and you see something, you know you made somebody unhappy. To this day, I don't know who it was. I don't think it was a foreign entity, but there is some element that I extremely angered. I don't say that flippantly; I say that very seriously because I thought my life was in danger. You can't get into details because it's part of the investigation. At some point, I'm happy to talk about it publicly.

[56:19 -> 59:59]

Tucker Carlson:

As they say in the intelligence business, you don't acknowledge your tail. I don't want to acknowledge some other things I've noticed that maybe... you believe you've been surveilled and threatened?

David Grusch:

Oh, 100%. It was obvious to me. I mean, it was blatant. Let's just say what I observed was so concerning that I ended up reporting it to the authorities. I asked my agency for certain protective measures, but I can't get into that detail. I was certainly petrified. At the same time that those things were happening to me personally, they were happening to another public figure known to the world, as well as another former intelligence officer near my home. It was some kind of planned multi-person intimidation activity that was very disturbing. I'll just leave it at that. I'm not doing this for fun; I'm serious. I'm doing this interview because it's protective for me. I don't want to be anonymous. I'm not here for attention. This is a nightmare to even be public. I'm used to working in a vault and briefing generals. This is not me. I'm not a public communicator, although I'm trying.

Tucker Carlson:

You're doing a very good job communicating.

David Grusch:

I appreciate it, but this is a serious subject with serious consequences, and I have suffered a lot of serious consequences. As you know, you've totally convinced me of your sincerity. There was a lot of whispering about your motives—this is an OP. Why now? Why are we learning all this? People think that I'm part of some CIA operation or something. First of all, I've never signed any paperwork to be part of an operation in that regard. Unfortunately, there isn't a plan. I'm not part of a plan. I ended up becoming a leader of a faction of former and current government officials who would like change in a legal way. I encourage anyone watching who has participated in those programs to explore multiple legal avenues, such as going to the Arrow Office or the Intelligence Community Inspector General, like I did, or another cognizant inspector general, to legally provide this information. There are also illegal but morally defensible avenues, like coming on this show. I'd be delighted to host anyone who wants to tell the truth about what they've seen. There's no justification for hiding this; that's my evaluation. I'd be happy to take that risk to have that person on.

Tucker Carlson:

Given your own experience, when government employees say to you, "Wow, someone was killed by the U.S. government for talking about this or planning to talk about it," it sounds like you would have to take those claims seriously.

David Grusch:

I did. I remember a very credible senior intelligence officer making those allegations in front of senior officials on Capitol Hill. I was in the room with elected officials and their staff. I don't want to get into details, but that's crazy. At that point, if somebody says the U.S. government killed an American citizen without a trial because he was going to tell the truth about something, that's when everything stops. You can't have that in a free country. I think people are just paralyzed in fear because that's a reality. I remember certain professional staff members being very upset in the room, and rightly so. We need to do something about that.

[1:00:01 -> 1:00:43]

David Grusch:

Because that's not good, and most of the people that I interviewed, I'm like, "Do you want to go to the Inspector General with me?" and they're like, "we'll back you up, but we don't want our names on any complaints," because they were just living in fear. You know, for my whole life, I never even thought UFOs were real until fairly recently. Me either. Four years ago, if you had asked me if I thought UFOs were real, I would have laughed. I took it completely seriously. But the conventional explanation for the U.S. government, among those who believed it was hiding these facts, was that the government doesn't want to cause panic and doesn't want to admit weakness in the face of its adversaries, etc. Those explanations do not account for the behavior you're describing.

[1:00:45 -> 1:01:29]

Tucker Carlson:

At first, they're hiding something real that implicates them. If they're talking to these entities, whatever they are, I believe, based on evidence, that the U.S. government has made contact and has had continuous, or at least sporadic, contact over a period of years. You don't need to nod or shake your head, but that is my belief based on talking to people. What is that?

David Grusch:

Yes, there's certainly a relationship that was cultivated with non-human intelligences, hypothetically. To play off of what you just said, good or bad, it's almost like we were afraid after 9/11 of dirty bombs and terrorists. Okay, well, that's nature; that's the yin and yang of the universe. If there are malevolent non-human intelligences, that's a fact of life.

[1:01:31 -> 1:02:19]

Tucker Carlson:

Life shouldn't be hidden. What if the U.S. populace needs to be prepared for something? Hypothetically, it's also not their right to hide it because they don't own the government; the public does.

David Grusch:

Exactly. I understand the reasons at first, but like you said, I think it's just the moral decay and the decline in leadership. Once again, we don't want to revisit what we did years ago. But if the U.S. government has had contact with these entities—and it is my informed belief that they have—what are they discussing? I would like to know too. I mean, I grew up watching Star Trek, so I say that somewhat whimsically. But for my generation, those under 40, we're not shocked. That's cool. A Gen Z'er who's 18 would...

[1:02:22 -> 1:03:10]

Tucker Carlson:

If they found out this stuff was real, they would want to study physics. Yes, this is how you boost STEM in this country, for goodness' sake. I mean, this is like the most exciting thing—yes, a little scary, but overall it's exciting. I mean, nothing's happened; we're still living. I'm able to talk about this, and nothing's happening to the world, if you will. So I think it's exciting for young people, and I think it's the right time to do this.

Going back in history, there are all sorts of mysteries about history that we just can't explain even now. But it sounds like it would not be surprising to learn that people 3,000 years ago had contact with these. I mean, you look at the works of Jacques Vallée, a famous researcher; his character was portrayed in...

[1:03:13 -> 1:04:04]

Tucker Carlson:

There's a character in "Close Encounters of the Third Kind" by Stephen Spielberg. That guy exists; his name is Jacques Vallee, and he has a

PhD. He's a smart scientist who has looked into this. There are a couple of books, like "Passport to Magonia" and some others—I'm probably butchering the name—where he explored this phenomenon throughout antiquity. People often say, "Oh, it's probably aerial technology," etc. However, we've been seeing the same types of sightings since antiquity. This could also reinforce stories in theological texts, such as the Bible, where people actually saw Ezekiel's wheels, as Timothy Shett has exposed publicly. Maybe that actually happened. Now, unfortunately, you might be bursting a worldview or a bubble for some people, but it could ultimately reinforce their belief systems because these stories...

[1:04:07 -> 1:04:58]

Tucker Carlson:

In the religious texts, there are accounts that aren't merely fables or allegories; they actually happened. I'm not saying all of them did, but there might be evidence if we were openly and honestly studying the subject in more detail.

Amazing. Last question—it's a small question, but there is clearly some connection between nuclear weapons, nuclear energy, and the sightings of these phenomena. I mean, they've been observed around U.S. military installations that have nuclear capabilities. What do you make of that?

David Grusch:

You wonder if the nuclear testing was almost like a beacon. Anyone observing from a distance might think, "whoa, the monkey has discovered ten to the sixth tons of TNT energy extraction." They're close; maybe they're only an order of magnitude away from energy extraction to develop technology that they might have, hypothetically.

[1:05:00 -> 1:05:49]

David Grusch:

There have been sightings that resemble a lighthouse; we turned it on, and now they seem more interested. It might also be a symptom of what we call collection bias, where modern society is more calibrated to look for that kind of phenomenon. There were Sci-Fi movies in the 30s and 40s, and perhaps people began looking up more during that time. However, there is certainly some kind of nuclear connection. What it means, I don't know. They are obviously performing some kind of reconnaissance and surveillance of us, particularly concerning our nuclear weapons and facilities. If anyone is interested, I recommend reading a book called "UFOs and Nukes" by Robert Hastings. He spent over 40 years interviewing Air Force missileers and other credible witnesses, including a very famous incident in 1967 involving Bob Salas.

[1:05:52 -> 1:06:19]

Tucker Carlson:

Shut down the base, shut down the nukes. We should take those observers seriously; they're trained, they have clearances, and they have their jobs on the line in that regard. There is a nuclear connection, and I encourage people to read that book. But what does it

mean? I have no idea. Well, you're a brave man, and I'll be honest, I didn't know what to think because there's a lot of whispering about you. However, I think you're totally sincere, and I really appreciate you doing this.